DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 427 483 EC 307 054

AUTHOR	Bear, George G.
TITLE	Interim Alternative Educational Settings: Related Research and Program Considerations.
INSTITUTION	National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Alexandria, VA.
SPONS AGENCY	Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1999-01-00
NOTE	68p.
CONTRACT	HS92015001
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055) -- Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Behavior Disorders; Behavior Problems; *Discipline; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Emotional Disturbances; Instructional Effectiveness; Intervention; *Nontraditional Education; Program Design; Program Effectiveness; Special Programs; *Student Placement
IDENTIFIERS	Behavioral Assessment; Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; *Interim Alternative Educational Settings

ABSTRACT

This report discusses the discipline of students with disabilities in schools, and new provisions in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) that allow school personnel to order a change in a student's placement to an interim alternative educational setting (IAES) under certain circumstances. The first section provides a brief historical perspective on discipline for students with disabilities and the emergence of the IAES concept. Increased public concern about violence, drugs, and weapons in schools is noted and several political and legislative factors related to such concern are discussed. Following this background information, there is a discussion of the unique characteristics of some IAESs, with particular attention paid to the critical role that links assessment with intervention. The last section presents a summary review of the effectiveness of school-based interventions for students with chronic conduct problems. It is designed to be of practical value to educators in developing and implementing state and local guidelines for IAESs. Promising interventions involve parent management training, family therapy, and home-school collaboration. Appendices include information on domains to be addressed in assessment and intervention, effective classroom management, strategies for correcting disruptive behavior, and instructional and curricular adaptations. (Contains 125 references.) (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 427 483

Interim Alternative Educational Settings:

Related Research and Program Considerations

by

George G. Bear, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
University of Delaware

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

January, 1999

Prepared for:
Project FORUM
National Association of State Directors of Special Education
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314

EC 307054

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Interim Alternative Educational Settings: Related Research and Program Considerations

by

George G. Bear, Ph.D.
University of Delaware

Year 5 Deliverable #5-4-4
Under Contract No. HS92015001
January 1999

Prepared for:
Office of Special Education Programs
U.S. Department of Education

Prepared by:
Project FORUM
National Association of State Directors of Special Education
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314

Project FORUM at National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) is a contract funded by the Office of Special Education Programs of the U. S. Department of Education. The project carries out a variety of activities that provide information needed for program improvement, and promote the utilization of research data and other information for improving outcomes for students with disabilities. The project also provides technical assistance and information on emerging issues, and convenes small work groups to gather expert input, obtain feedback, and develop conceptual frameworks related to critical topics in special education.

This report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Department of Education (Contract No. HS92015001.) However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Project FORUM extends its sincere appreciation to the individuals whose efforts have served to enrich the quality and accuracy of this document. The individuals listed below, who constituted a Quality Review Panel for this work, have reviewed and commented on an earlier draft of this document. Our acknowledgment of their involvement does not necessarily indicate their endorsement of this final document.

Kathryn Carroll
Option Program
Christina School District
Newark, DE

Christy Chambers
Executive Director
Lockport Area Special Education Co-op, IL

Kathy Chambery
Director of Special Education
Sante Fe Public Schools, NM

Kevin P. Dwyer
Assistant Executive Director
National Association of School Psychologists
Bethesda, MD

Pat Guthrie
Assistant Superintendent for Student Services
Warren County Schools, KY
Past President of Council of Administrators
of Special Education (CASE)

Eric P. Hartwig
Administrator/Psychologist
Marathon County Special Education, WI

Thomas A. Jeschke
Director of Special Education
Des Moines Independent School District, IA

Eileen F. McCarthy
Director of Special Education
Board of Cooperative Educational Services
Rockland County, NY

Carl R. Smith
Administrator
Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center
Drake University, IA

Edward Lee Vargas
Superintendent
Santa Fe Public Schools, NM

Manuscript Submitted May 1998

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract iii
Purpose and Overview 1
Background 2
Zero Tolerance versus Zero Rejection 2
Suspension and Expulsion 3
Interim Alternative Educational Settings 4
Provisions in the 1997 Amendments to the IDEA 4
Research on IAESs 5
Unique Characteristics of the IAES 6
Assessment Linked With Intervention 7
Best Practices in Assessment 7
Functional Behavioral Assessment 9
The Problem Solving Approach to Linking Assessment with Intervention 10
Problem Solving Steps for Linking Assessment with Intervention in the IAES 11
School-based Interventions for the IAES 12
Classroom management and teaching strategies - *What's Promising?* 13
Teaching Social Problem Solving and Social Decision Making Skills - *What's Promising?* 17
School- and District-Wide Programs - *What's Promising?* 19
Interventions that Involve Parents and Family - *What's Promising?* 21
Alternative Education Programs - *What might (or might not) work?* 22
Individual Counseling - *What might (or might not) work?* 24
Peers Play the Primary Role - *What's unlikely to work?* 24
Recreation and Community Service Activities - *What's unlikely to work?* 25
Fear Arousal, Moral Appeal and Affective Education - *What's unlikely to work?* 26
Two Additional Model Programs 26
Necessary Components of Effective Programs 27
Qualified Staff with Knowledge of Child Development and Cultural Diversity 27
Interagency Collaboration 29
Evaluation 30
Summing Up 32
References 34

Appendices
A - Domains to be Addressed in Assessment and Intervention 45
B - Effective Classroom Management 49
C - Strategies for Correcting Disruptive Behavior 52
D - Instructional and Curricular Adaptations 59

Abstract

The 1997 Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) balances the need for safe schools for all children and the rights of children with disabilities to a free appropriate public education (FAPE) and procedural safeguards. These Amendments allow school personnel to order a change in the placement to an *interim alternative educational setting* (IAES) for a student with a disability under certain circumstances. The first section of this document provides a brief historical perspective on discipline for students with disabilities and the emergence of the IAES concept. Increased public concern about violence, drugs, and weapons in schools is noted and several political and legislative factors related to such concern are discussed. Following this background information, there is a discussion of the unique characteristics of some IAESs, with particular attention paid to the critical role of linking assessment with intervention.

The last section presents a summary review of the effectiveness of school-based interventions for students with chronic conduct problems. Such research should be of practical value to educators in developing and implementing state and local guidelines for IAESs. Although there is an absence of research specific to IAESs, a substantial body of literature does exist on assessment and intervention practices which is applicable to the IAES. This literature can be found in the related fields of school psychology, educational psychology, child development, and school administration. Literature in special education and related fields provides educators with theory and research to guide the development of policy and program implementation for IAESs. The assessment and intervention recommendations discussed in this document are drawn largely from the literature in the above fields, especially literature specific to the topics of problem-solving assessment and consultation, classroom management, behavioral disorders, and juvenile delinquency. The reader is advised to use the IDEA statute and the final regulations for the legal requirements regarding IAESs.

Interim Alternative Educational Settings: Related Research and Program Considerations

Purpose and Overview

The 1997 Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) balances the need for safe schools for all children and protection of the rights of children with disabilities to a free appropriate public education (FAPE) and procedural safeguards. These amendments allow school personnel to order a change in placement to an *interim alternative educational setting* (IAES) for a student with a disability under certain circumstances. The primary purpose of this paper is to review research that may be of practical value to educators in developing and implementing state and local guidelines for IAESs.

The first section of this document briefly explains how the need for safe schools and the right to FAPE might conflict when students with disabilities are suspended or expelled from school. The next section reviews the purposes and features of IAESs and their potential implications for schools. Finally, the paper devotes primary attention to linking assessment with interventions of demonstrated effectiveness.

Multiple factors influence the behaviors of students who are subject to disciplinary action, such as placement into an IAES. For example, three behaviors specifically targeted in IAESs —carrying a weapon to school or a school function; knowingly possessing or using illegal drugs or selling or soliciting the sale of a controlled substance at school or a school function; and behavior determined by a hearing officer to be substantially likely to injure self or others—are typically influenced by a complex interaction of various personal and environmental factors, including a student's thinking, emotions, social skills, family, teachers, school, and community.

As shown by research discussed in this document, for interventions to be effective in both the short- and long-term, they must target as many of the factors mentioned above as feasible. That is, interventions should be comprehensive, broad-based, and enduring. It is unrealistic to expect most IAESs to deliver such interventions, especially since a student's placement in an IAES is limited. It is realistic, however, to expect personnel at an IAES to begin interventions, while simultaneously working with the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team in planning and coordinating interventions that would continue after the student leaves the IAES. Without continued services, it is very likely that behavior problems will recur, especially among students with chronic patterns of antisocial behavior. The responsibility for delivering all interventions and their success, should not fall solely in the hands of the school. As discussed in this document, it is appropriate that such responsibility be shared by the school, home, community agencies, and the student.

Background

Zero Tolerance versus Zero Rejection

In the 1990's, a *zero tolerance* approach towards violence, drugs, and weapons came to be viewed by some as being in conflict with a *zero rejection* approach in special education. In response to public concern about increasing violence, drugs, and weapons, Congress and many state legislatures passed laws designed to help schools achieve National Educational Goal #7—Safe, Disciplined, and Alcohol-and Drug-free Schools—of the Educate America Act (Goals 2000, 1994). This goal states that "Every school will be free of drugs, violence, and the unauthorized presence of firearms and alcohol, and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning by the year 2000." Typically framed to protect children's right to safety and to protect victims of violence, laws supporting Goal #7 reflect a zero tolerance approach toward drugs, violence, and other violations of the law. Zero tolerance policies vary across the country, but all state that the specified behavior will not be condoned and students who engage in the specified behavior will face consequences. Zero tolerance is not synonymous with suspension and expulsion; however, many students who engage in the specified behavior are eventually suspended or expelled from school.

At the federal level, the *zero tolerance* approach is clearly stated in the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994, an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This act requires that "...each State receiving Federal funds under this Act shall have in effect a State law requiring local educational agencies to expel from school for a period of not less than one year a student who is determined to have brought a weapon to a school under the jurisdiction of local educational agencies in that State, except that such State law shall allow the chief administering officer of such local educational agency to modify such expulsion requirement for a student on a case-by-case basis." The term "weapon" is defined as "firearm" in this Act. [20 U.S.C. Sec.14601 (b)(1)]. It is important to note that expulsion from school means removal from the school where the violation occurred, not denial of educational services.

While legislators and educators developed punitive laws and policies designed to exclude students from school, it became apparent that if individual determinations were not made consistent with the provisions of the IDEA, such exclusion likely violated students with disabilities' right to FAPE and to placement in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). Moreover, exclusion and placement in restrictive educational settings often conflicted with the *inclusion* initiatives of many states, professional organizations, and parent groups.

The IDEA has always made it clear that all children with disabilities are guaranteed the right to have FAPE made available to them in the LRE. This includes those who possess weapons or illegal drugs and those who exhibit violent behavior. Although placement in the regular classroom is the stronger preference stated in the IDEA, the report language supports the continuum of placements noted in the Regulations. Changes from one placement to another along the continuum can be made if all procedural safeguards and all other provisions of the IDEA are followed.

Suspension and Expulsion

The right of all children to safe and orderly schools is subject to little, if any, controversy. Few disagree that weapons, drugs, and violence should not be tolerated in our schools. What to do with students who bring weapons and drugs to school or who engage in violent acts is a different matter, however. Suspension and expulsion are two common consequences. Considerable debate has recently centered around using long-term suspension and expulsion with students with disabilities, and the effectiveness of these two practices.

Concerns About the Use of Long-Term Suspension and Expulsion and their Effectiveness

The courts have made it clear that the discipline practices of suspension and expulsion, but especially the latter, often violate the rights of students with disabilities (see Hartwig and Ruesch, 1994 for a review). School officials cannot ensure school safety simply by adopting a *zero tolerance* or "get tough" policy, especially one that denies FAPE to children with disabilities. Although suspension and expulsion may be used for some students with disabilities, their applications are governed by provisions in the IDEA.

The appropriateness of suspension and expulsion, but especially the latter, also can be challenged from the perspective of intervention effectiveness. As with incarceration, the purposes of suspension and expulsion is generally to punish the offender, protect others, and deter the offender and other students from committing the same transgressions. For many students, suspension and expulsion serve these purposes. However, it is unclear whether or not suspension and expulsion are effective among those students with chronic patterns of antisocial behavior (i.e., those most likely to be placed into an IAES). Several arguments can be voiced against suspension and expulsion as effective interventions for such students:

- When not in school and unsupervised, students with chronic behavior problems are at great risk for committing delinquent acts. For example, in 1993, 85 percent of daytime crimes in Los Angeles were committed by truant adolescents (Stephens, 1997).

- Many chronic offenders do not perceive suspension and expulsion as "punishment," but as a way to escape from an environment they find aversive.

- Victims are protected while they are in school and their offenders are absent, but they are not protected after school hours or when the offenders return to school.

- There is little evidence that suspension and expulsion deter other students from engaging in the same behaviors.

- Suspension and expulsion may actually increase the risk of academic failure and dropping out of school by precluding much needed academic and social instruction.

In the absence of effective intervention, it is well established that students with discipline problems, particularly problems involving aggression, are at considerable risk for maladjustment during adolescence and adulthood. This maladjustment may include dropping out of school, juvenile delinquency and criminality, teenage pregnancy, substance abuse, and mental health problems (Kupersmidt, Coie, & Dodge, 1990). These risks are greatest for students with disabilities. Students with emotional disturbance are twice as likely as students without disabilities to drop out of school (Office of Special Education Programs, 1994). Data from 1998 indicates that students with disabilities are three to four times more likely to be incarcerated (U.S. Department of Justice, 1990). School drop outs and incarcerated citizens put a drain on society in the form of increased unemployment, reduced tax revenues, expensive treatment and incarceration, and the personal harm and property damage caused by crime. This is a strong argument for keeping students in school and providing FAPE.

Interim Alternative Educational Settings

Provisions in the 1997 Amendments to the IDEA

The IAES provision is an attempt to help educators balance the rights of students with disabilities, including the right to FAPE, with the right of all students to safe and orderly schools. The term "interim alternative educational setting" related to students with disabilities first appeared in federal legislation in the 1994 Jeffords Amendment to the IDEA. This amendment allowed school personnel to place a student with a disability who was determined to have brought a weapon to school into an interim alternative educational setting for not more than 45 days. The term "weapon" meant "firearm" as defined in Section 921 of Title 18 of the United States Code. The 1997 Amendments to the IDEA allow for the placement of students with disabilities in IAESs as follows:

20 U.S.C. Sec. 1415 (k) Placement in alternative educational setting

(1) AUTHORITY OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL-

(A) School personnel under this section may order a change in the placement of a child with a disabilit
(i) to an appropriate interim alternative educational setting, another setting, or suspension, for not more than 10 school days (to the extent such alternatives would be applied to children without disabilities); and
(ii) to an appropriate interim alternative educational setting for the same amount of time that a child without a disability would be subject to discipline, but for not more than 45 days if--
(I) the child carries a weapon to school or to a school function under the jurisdiction of a State or a local educational agency; or
(II) the child knowingly possesses or uses illegal drugs or sells or solicits the sale of a controlled substance while at school or a school function under the jurisdiction of a State or local educational agency.

(B) Either before or not later than 10 days after taking a disciplinary action described in subparagraph (A)--
(i) if the local educational agency did not conduct a functional behavioral assessment and implement a behavioral intervention plan for such child before the behavior that resulted in the suspension described in subparagraph (A), the agency shall convene an IEP meeting to develop an assessment plan to address that behavior; or
(ii) if the child already has a behavioral intervention plan, the IEP Team shall review the plan and modify it, as necessary, to address the behavior.

(2) AUTHORITY OF HEARING OFFICER- A hearing officer under this section may order a change in the placement of a child with a disability to an appropriate interim alternative educational setting for not more than 45 days if the hearing officer--

(A) determines that the public agency has demonstrated by substantial evidence that maintaining the current placement of such child is substantially likely to result in injury to the child or to others;

(B) considers the appropriateness of the child's current placement;

(C) considers whether the public agency has made reasonable efforts to minimize the risk of harm in the child's current placement, including the use of supplementary aids and services; and

(D) determines that the interim alternative educational setting meets the requirements of paragraph (3) (B).

(3) DETERMINATION OF SETTING -

(A) IN GENERAL--The alternative educational setting described in paragraph (1) (A) (ii) shall be determined by the IEP Team.

(B) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS--Any interim alternative educational setting in which a child is placed under paragraph (1) or (2) shall--

(i) be selected so as to enable the child to continue to participate in the general curriculum, although in another setting, and to continue to receive those services and modifications, including those described in the child's current IEP, that will enable the child to meet the goals set out in that IEP; and

(ii) include services and modifications designed to address the behavior described in paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) so that it does not recur.

(4) MANIFESTATION DETERMINATION REVIEW-

(A) IN GENERAL- If a disciplinary action is contemplated as described in paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) for a behavior of a child with a disability described in either of those paragraphs, or if a disciplinary action involving a change of placement for more than 10 days is contemplated for a child with a disability who has engaged in other behavior that violated any rule or code of conduct of the local education agency that applies to all children -

(i) not later than the date on which the decision to take that action is made, the parents shall be notified of that decision and of all procedural safeguards accorded under this section; and

(ii) immediately, if possible, but in no case later than 10 school days after the date on which the decision to take that action is made, a review shall be conducted of the relationship between the child's disability and the behavior subject to the disciplinary action.

(B) INDIVIDUALS TO CARRY OUT REVIEW– A review described in subparagraph (A) shall be conducted by the IEP Team and other qualified personnel.

(C) CONDUCT OF REVIEW– In carrying out a review described in subparagraph (A), the IEP Team may determine that the behavior of the child was not a manifestation of such child's disability only if the IEP Team- -

(i) first considers, in terms of the behavior subject to disciplinary action, all relevant information, including-

(I) evaluation and diagnostic results, including such results or other relevant information supplied by the parents of the child;

(II) observations of the child; and

(III) the child's IEP and placement; and

(ii) then determines that–

(I) in the relationship to the behavior subject to disciplinary action, the child's IEP and placement were appropriate and the special education services, supplementary aids and services, and behavior intervention strategies were provided consistent with the child's IEP and placement;

(II) the child's disability did not impair the ability of the child to understand the impact and consequences of the behavior subject to disciplinary action; and

(III) the child's disability did not impair the ability of the child to control the behavior subject to disciplinary action.

Final federal regulations are likely to further clarify the statue; however, as of the writing of this document, regulations had not been issued.

Research on IAESs

Due to recent emergence of the term IAES, published research specific to this term is practically nonexistent. Placements similar in purpose were used (e.g., in-school suspension; change in placement to an alternative educational program) but it is not known to what extent the limited

research that has been conducted on these settings generalizes to requirement or characteristics of the IAES.

Although there is an absence of research specific to IAESs, a substantial body of literature does exist on assessment and intervention relating to behavior. This literature cuts across various disciplines, including school psychology, educational psychology, child development, special education, and school administration. The literature provides educators with theory and research that may help to guide the development and implementation of IAESs. Given the absence of research on IAESs, assessment and intervention recommendations discussed in this document are drawn largely from the literature on problem-solving assessment and consultation, classroom management, behavioral disorders, and juvenile delinquency. Before applying such research to IAESs, it is important to highlight the unique characteristics of IAESs and their implications for assessment and intervention practices.

Unique Characteristics of the IAES

Temporary Setting

School personnel may remove a student with a disability from his/her current placement to an IAES for not more than 45 days if the student carries a weapon to school or to a school function, knowingly possesses or uses illegal drugs, or sells or solicits the sale of a controlled substance while at school or a school function. A hearing officer may also order a change in the placement of a student with a disability to an IAES for not more than 45 days if maintaining the current placement is substantially likely to result in injury to the student or to others. The maximum number of days allowed in an IAES must not be greater than the number of days assigned to students without disabilities. The IAES generally provides a limited period of time during which a longer-term solution is developed. This differentiates the IAES from long-term alternative educational programs and other long-term placements.

Alternative Disciplinary Option

In responding to some behaviors subject to disciplinary action, as specified in the 1997 Amendments to the IDEA, the IAES, for example, provides an alternative to (a) keeping the student in his/her current placement, or (b) immediately changing the student's IEP and moving him/her to a more restricted setting through the normal change of placement provisions. Note that use of an IAES is not a necessary prerequisite to changing a student's placement. If a change of placement is appropriate and carried out consistent with provisions of the IDEA, including the procedural safeguards, moving the student into an IAES would be unnecessary. If the parent disputes a change in placement or the school disputes a return to the pre-IAES placement, a due process hearing would be available. Mediation also would be available, at a minimum when a due process hearing is requested.

Many schools may not perceive the need for IAESs, believing that in most cases of rule violations the student would return to his/her current setting, following a less than 10-day

suspension, without the need for an IAES. If the student's behavior is serious enough to warrant placement in an IAES, then an immediate and more lasting change in placement may be needed—a change that might be made more expeditiously without the use of an IAES. In determining whether an IAES or change in placement is necessary, assessment of those variables that led to the student's removal from his/her current placement may be needed. Such an assessment is critical for developing interventions that improve behavior, irrespective of setting.

Educational Function

IAESs must be selected so as to allow the student "to continue to participate in the general curriculum....and to continue to receive those services and modifications, including those described in the child's current IEP, that will enable the child to meet the goals set out in that IEP", as well as receive services and modifications designed to address the problem behavior [20 U.S.C. Sec. 1415 (k)(3)(B)(i) and (ii)]. These requirements could help to determine the location of the IAES. That is, whether the setting is located inside or outside of the student's current school building is likely to be determined by factors such as those that determine other special educational placements. Some districts may adapt existing alternative education programs (located either within or outside the school) to serve as the IAES, whereas other districts may adapt in-school suspension rooms or intervention resource rooms to function as IAESs.

Opportunity to Develop an Intervention Plan Linked to Assessment

Either before or not later than 10 school days after being placed in an IAES, "...the agency shall convene an IEP meeting to develop an assessment plan to address that behavior..." [20 U.S.C. Sec.1415 (k)(1)(B)(i)]. If an assessment was done previously and the student "...has a behavioral intervention plan, the IEP team shall review the plan and modify it, as necessary, to address the behavior" [20 U.S.C. Sec.1415 (k)(1)(B)(ii)]. As such, assessment must be directly linked to the development of an intervention plan designed to prevent the behavior from recurring.

Assessment Linked With Intervention

During the time a student is in an IAES, schools or other public agencies are required to assess (or review), if not done previously, factors that led to the student's behavior. Research and policy call for the linkage of assessment with interventions, to prevent the problem behavior from recurring.

Best Practices in Assessment

The concept of "assessment linked with intervention" is not new in school psychology and special education. The idea that assessment should lead to more than diagnosis and the designation of special education services has been argued by multiple writers (Fagan & Wise, 1994; Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995) and is the position of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP,

1994b), and the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASP & NASDSE, 1994).

In a document by NASP (1994), key characteristics of a *best practices approach* to linking assessment with intervention were identified. The following are characteristics of such an assessment:

- Uses multiple tools and strategies, such as: standardized norm-referenced tests, curriculum-based measures, portfolio assessments, work samples, rating scales, reviews of records, observations, and interviews.
- Gathers information from multiple sources, including teachers, parents, the student, and peers (where appropriate).
- Occurs in multiple environments (e.g., home, school and community), in supervised and unsupervised settings, and across teachers and classrooms.
- Occurs across time.
- Begins with the identification of problems and continues through intervention implementation (i.e., is ongoing and formative in its process).
- Identifies the current individual and unique educational needs of the student.
- Provides an understanding of multiple factors, external and internal to the student, that may influence his/her behavior.
- Provides an understanding of multiple factors, external and internal to the student, that may influence his/her behavior.
- Provides comprehensive and relevant information "in all areas of suspected disability" [20 U.S.C. Sec.1414 (b)(3)(C)]. (Where appropriate this would include health, vision, hearing, social and emotional status, general intelligence, academic performance, communicative status, and motor disabilities.)
- Provides relevant information that helps the IEP team and other school personnel develop, implement, and evaluate the IEP and appropriate interventions, supports, and services.
- Includes, whenever a manifestation determination is conducted, an assessment of the student's ability "to understand the impact and consequences of the behavior subject to disciplinary action " [20 U.S.C. Sec.1415 (k)(4)(C)(ii)(II)] and "to control the behavior subject to disciplinary action"[20 U.S.C.Sec.1415 (k)(4)(C)(ii)(III)].

- Uses "technically sound instruments that may assess the relative contribution of cognitive and behavioral factors, in addition to physical or developmental factors" [20 U.S.C. Sec.1414 (b)(2)(C)].

- Addresses legal and ethical guidelines (in addition to those above), including the use of measures that are not discriminatory, given in the student's native language, validated for the specific purposes for which they are used, and that are administered correctly by trained and knowledgeable personnel [20 U.S.C. Sec.1414 (b)(3)(A) & (B)].

Functional Behavioral Assessment

The gathering of behavioral information receives particular emphasis in the 1997 Amendments to the IDEA, with reference to disciplinary action and the placement of students with disabilities into an IAES. A *functional behavioral assessment* (FBA) is now required for the purpose of developing and implementing a *behavioral intervention plan* that addresses the behavior subject to the disciplinary action. Because the FBA requirement first is new in the 1997 Amendments, it is open to differing interpretations. Already, some have interpreted the concept from a narrow operant behavioral perspective in which the focus of assessment is on observable behaviors and the environmental antecedents and consequences specific to the context in which the behavior problem occurred (Broussard & Northup, 1995; Lewis & Sugai, 1996; Vollmer & Northup, 1996). This perspective may neglect the role of cognitions and emotions in mediating behavior. Recognizing that a narrow perspective is likely to result in a procedure that "will be limited to a few persons, situations, behaviors or variables" (Haynes & O'Brien, 1990, p. 4), others have chosen to view FBA more broadly. While emphasizing that behavior often is a function of environmental events, a broader view also emphasizes that multiple personal factors (beliefs, attitudes, goals, values, emotions, reasoning, expectations) are interrelated with behavior and one's environment (Batsche & Knoff, 1995; Dwyer, 1998).

What constitutes best practice in FBA is not clear in the 1997 Amendments to the IDEA and will be debated among researchers and educators in the coming years. However, regardless of whether a narrow or broad conceptualization of FBA is adopted, the intent of its inclusion in the 1997 Amendments is to emphasize the need for assessment information that is relevant (i.e, useful, practical) to the IEP team in developing the educational plan and interventions.

As emphasized throughout the rest of this document, it is critical that assessment not be limited to a focus on a singular behavior, nor to a singular factor contributing to the behavior. Rarely does a student who brings a weapon to school, or uses drugs, or aggresses toward others exhibit only one problem behavior. As noted by Kazdin (1994, p. 345), "Antisocial behaviors often come in packages." Not only do antisocial behaviors come in packages, but so do serious disorders. For example, a child identified as emotionally disturbed is likely to have one or more specific disorders such as Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder or substance abuse. The greater the number of deviant behaviors and contributing factors, the greater the risk for continued, and more serious, problems (Kazdin, 1994). In turn, there is a greater need for interventions that address multiple

behaviors and their contributory factors. Thus, a critical best practice in assessment and intervention for students placed into IAESs is not to focus on a singular behavior or intervention.

The Problem-Solving Approach to Linking Assessment with Intervention

For students with disabilities involved in disciplinary actions, assessment often will require little, if any, use of standardized norm-referenced tests. Instead of focusing on diagnosis, assessment must emphasize gathering information that will be of practical value to the IEP team (or to an hearing officer) for the purpose of:

- ✔ Understanding the relationship between the student's problem behavior, various environmental factors (both proximal and distal), and the student's individual characteristics (e.g., cognitions, emotions, social skills) that influenced the behavior (e.g., the situational context, peer influences, family and home factors), and

- ✔ Developing, implementing, and evaluating interventions that address the student's behavior during, and following, placement in the IAES.

The most common process used in school psychology and special education to link assessment with intervention is the problem -solving process. Although there are variations on the problem-solving approach, school consultation models typically use the following four steps: (1) problem identification, (2) problem analysis, (3) plan or treatment development, (4) plan or treatment evaluation (Batsche & Knoff, 1995; Kratochwill & Bergan, 1990; Sheridan, Kratochwill, & Bergan, 1996).

In applying the problem-solving approach to the process of linking assessment with intervention for students with behavior problems, Batsche and Knoff (1995) recommend that an IEP team reference each problem-solving step to six categories of characteristics, or conditions, that influence behavior: (1) student characteristics, (2) teacher characteristics, (3) peer characteristics, (4) curriculum issues, (5) school environment issues, and (6) family/community factors. Characteristics and conditions included under each of these categories can be found in Appendix A.

The characteristics and conditions in each of these categories serve to help the IEP team develop specific hypotheses about the student's behavior, which are linked with interventions designed to address each characteristic or condition. Using the Referral Question Consultation (RQC) model, Batsche and Knoff (1995) recommend that the IEP team follow ten guiding steps during the problem-solving process. These steps, as modified elsewhere by Dwyer (1998) and here by Bear to apply more directly to the IAES, are described in the following section.

Problem-Solving Steps for Linking Assessment with Intervention in the IAES[1]

The following steps exemplify how the problem-solving approach might be applied to the process of linking assessment with intervention in cases involving placement in an IAES. Many different variations of these steps will, and should, be developed by IEP teams.

Problem Identification

1. *Review* all existing information available on the referred student and collect additional information, as needed, related to each category of characteristics/conditions in Appendix A. This includes the relation of the student's behavior to the situational context and cognitions and emotions that mediate the targeted behavior and related behaviors.

2. *Interview* teachers, parents, the student, and others, as needed, to identify (a) the specific behavior that led to the disciplinary action, (b) additional existing problem behaviors, and (c) positive behaviors that might replace the problem behaviors. If additional information is needed to identify the above behaviors, gather such information using behavior checklists, observations, additional interviews, etc.

Problem Analysis

3. *Develop hypotheses* that might explain the student's problem behaviors, especially the behavior that led to disciplinary action. (e.g., Was the setting too unstructured? Do deficits exist in anger control, social skills, or social decision making?)

4. *Develop prediction statements* that might be helpful in choosing assessment methods. (e.g., If teased by peers in an unsupervised setting, he is likely to physically aggress. He is more likely to aggress if he perceives hostile intentions by others.).

5. *Develop referral questions*, based on the above information, to guide the assessment process and confirm or reject the hypotheses and prediction statements. (e.g., How often does his behavior occur in structured situations? When presented with real life or hypothetical problem situations, how often does he attribute his aggression to the behavior of others?)

6. *Administer multiple assessment procedures*, as needed, to answer the referral questions, serve as baseline data, and facilitate the link between assessment and intervention (e.g., student, teacher, and parent interviews).

7. *Apply information gathered* from the background review and current assessment to answer the referral questions and to confirm or reject the generated hypotheses. (e.g., Given the

---

[1] From "Linking Assessment to Intervention" by G. M. Batsche and H. M. Knoff. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.) "Best Practices in School Psychology III, (pp. 577-578), 1995, Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists. Adapted with permission.

student's emotional disturbance and the situational context, his action reflects cognitive and emotional deficits, especially those that lead to aggression when provoked by peers in unsupervised settings.)

Plan Development and Intervention

8. *Review and select appropriate research-supported interventions* for decreasing behavior problems and for promoting replacement behaviors specific to the referred student. Interventions should match those hypotheses that have been confirmed (e.g., anger control training, student/school/home contingency contract, social skills training). Examine existing interventions in light of such a review and modify them, if appropriate. Develop necessary details regarding the intervention, (e.g., Who implements what? Where? When? And how?) and implement accordingly.

Plan Evaluation

9. *Monitor and evaluate* decreases in problem behaviors (e.g., acts of aggression) and increases in replacement behaviors (e.g., prosocial behavior) to determine the effectiveness of the interventions. Develop and implement strategies that should promote the maintenance of the behavior over time and its generalization across settings.

10. *Revise the IEP* to include a behavioral intervention plan that incorporates the above components, as appropriate.

School-Based Interventions for the IAES

The value and popularity of a problem-solving approach lies in its focus on linking assessment with intervention. Research shows that both teachers and school psychologists prefer a problem -solving approach to addressing student's behavior problems, particularly an approach that emphasizes collaboration among professionals over a *test-to-diagnosis* approach (Erchul & Martens, 1997). Another attractive feature of the problem-solving approach is that its focus on school-based intervention is consistent with the 1997 Amendments to the IDEA, particularly amendments related to discipline problems among students with disabilities. Moreover, the approach's emphasis meshes well with the federal government's recent interest in school-based interventions for students with serious behavior problems. Such interest is seen in the Department of Education's initiatives toward school discipline and in recent reports by the Department of Justice (Gottfredson, 1997) and the Department of Health and Human Services (Healthy People 2000, 1990).

To increase the likelihood that behavior leading to placement in an IAES does not recur, it is critical that school-based interventions are guided not only by the multi-trait and multi-method assessment procedures, as presented previously, but also by knowledge of research and theory about what works. This section examines interventions—both specific strategies and general programs—

that research has shown to be effective in preventing or decreasing antisocial behavior, especially aggression and substance abuse.

Due to recent inclusion of the term IAES in the 1997 Amendments and the absence of published studies on the effectiveness of IAESs, it is premature to present "what works in the IAES." However, it is not too early to recommend interventions that show promise. Promising interventions for the IAES are interventions that have already been shown to be effective for students with antisocial behavior, irrespective of their placement. Although multiple reviews and original studies are referred to in this section, Gottfredson's (1997) recent review of school-based programs for reducing violence and substance abuse receives primary attention. Gottfredson's review was funded by the Department of Justice and reported to Congress, increasing the likelihood that her conclusions, as summarized here, might impact federal and state policies toward school-based interventions.

No attempt is made in this review to distinguish between primary-level interventions (preventive interventions designed to include all children), secondary-level interventions (interventions designed for children *at risk*), and tertiary interventions (treatments). Distinctions between these three levels of intervention often are blurred, with few strategies unique to any one level. The most common differences between primary, secondary, and tertiary levels of intervention are the amount of emphasis placed on a particular strategy, the strength of the intervention, and the extent to which interventions are combined to address the behavior of concern. Although the three levels of intervention are not distinguished here, an effective schoolwide plan should provide intervention programs for three student populations: all students, students *at risk*, and students requiring treatment (Bear, 1995). Likewise, the plan should include interventions and accommodations for dealing with <u>all</u> levels of severity, at least for the short term.

A wealth of research has demonstrated the short-term effectiveness of a variety of behavioral interventions for decreasing a variety of targeted antisocial behavior (see Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 1995). However, research also shows that interventions are unlikely to lead to improvements in behavior that generalize to other behaviors, settings, and across time unless they are sustained over time, are broad-based, and target multiple factors that contribute to antisocial behavior (Kazdin, 1994). It should be noted, however, that even when these elements exist, results often are discouraging for students with chronic patterns of antisocial behavior that include guns, drugs, and violence. Nevertheless, several promising school-based intervention programs provide reason for optimism. Optimism is particularly warranted when interventions are implemented early, before a child has developed a chronic pattern of antisocial behavior.

Classroom management and teaching strategies - *What's Promising?*

Combined Proactive, Corrective, and Instructive Strategies

Upon placing a student in an IAES, immediate attention should be directed to teacher strategies for managing the student's behavior and preventing classroom behavior problems. Whereas controlling and punitive strategies, such as punishing, threatening, yelling, blaming,

criticizing the student, scolding, and using sarcasm, often lead to immediate improvement in behavior, such improvement is the result of "grudging compliance" (Brophy, 1996). Use of more positive-oriented proactive (i.e., preventive) strategies increases the likelihood of "willing compliance." Proactive strategies tend to focus more on antecedents than consequences of behavior. They include making eye contact, controlling through touch or physical presence, use of humor, cuing of appropriate behavior, praising the student and peers, stating reality and showing awareness, asking rhetorical questions, and involving the student's parent in a supportive, preventive role.

Interestingly, the use of power assertive and punitive strategies to control behavior (e.g., warnings and threats, punishment, and contacting parents and administrators) does not differentiate ineffective from effective teachers (Brophy, 1996). Ineffective and effective teachers alike use such strategies. What differentiates effective from ineffective teachers when dealing with hostile and defiant students is that effective teachers use power assertive and punishment-oriented strategies less frequently, relying instead on proactive strategies for preventing behavior problems. When punishment-oriented strategies are needed, they are combined with positive-oriented corrective strategies for developing replacement behaviors (e.g., reinforcement of appropriate behavior) and with instructive strategies for promoting social decision-making and problem-solving abilities. This combination of positive-oriented proactive strategies, positive- and punishment-oriented corrective strategies, and positive-oriented instructive strategies serves the dual purpose of managing behavior in the short-term and developing self-discipline over the long-term. Brophy called this style of effective classroom management "authoritative."

These findings are consistent with research in child development that shows that authoritative parents, like authoritative teachers, combine proactive, corrective, and instructive strategies. In using these strategies, teachers and parents (a) work to build a relationship of warmth and acceptance, (b) set high standards and hold high expectations with respect to socially responsible behavior, (c) enforce rules and standards in a firm, fair, and consistent manner, (d) and promote autonomy by encouraging the child's active participation in decisions regarding his/her behavior (Steinberg, 1996). The authoritative style, especially when contrasted with harsh or permissive styles, has repeatedly been linked to fewer conduct problems in school, home, and community, less drug and alcohol use, better school performance, and positive self-perceptions. These findings hold true irrespective of one's socioeconomic status or ethnic background (Steinberg, 1996). Proactive and corrective/instructive classroom management strategies commonly used by authoritative teachers (and parents) are included in Appendices B & C.

The value of both positive and punitive strategies for correcting behavior was shown in a recent meta-analysis of strategies for reducing disruptive classroom behavior, which included the behavior of children with emotional disturbance and conduct disorders (Stage & Quiroz, 1997). Appendix C contains many of the strategies included in this analysis. Results showed that on the average, 78 percent of disruptive students who received an intervention exhibited a decrease in disruptive classroom behavior. These findings are consistent with other reviews of research on the effectiveness of both positive and punitive behavioral interventions in bringing about short-term improvements in a variety behaviors (Kazdin et al., 1990; Martens & Meller, 1990; Prout & DeMartino, 1986; Weisz et al., 1995).

Although punitive techniques (e.g., taking away privileges, time-out, and in-school suspension) play a necessary role in school discipline, they should be used in combination with more positive and instructive strategies. The limitations and negative effects of a steady diet of punitive strategies are well known (Doyle, 1989; Hyman, 1997; Martens & Meller, 1990). This applies not only to the use of corporal punishment, still used in about one half of the states, but also to other punitive and controlling strategies. Among the limitations and negative effects of punishment-oriented strategies are:

- They do not teach replacement behaviors such as prosocial alternatives.
- Their effects are short term.
- Inappropriate behavior may be unintentionally reinforced (e.g., when the student desires to be removed from the classroom or when the peer and adult attention is unintentionally reinforcing).
- They do little to change student cognitions or feelings that underlie the misbehavior.
- They often harm the student-teacher relationship.
- They often produce resentment, retaliation, and/or emotions that are counterproductive to learning.

Given these limitations and negative effects, most researchers endorse the use of mild punishment-oriented strategies, but only if combined with proactive, positive, and instructive strategies for reinforcing and teaching appropriate behavior (Bear, 1998; 1995; Brophy, 1996; Emmer, Evertson, Clements, Sanford, & Worsham, 1994; Martens & Meller, 1990).

Instructional and curricular adaptations

An important component of classroom management is adapting instruction and curriculum to meet the individual needs of students. A large number of studies have demonstrated the critical role of effective instructional techniques and curricula in promoting learning and preventing behavior problems. Research shows that students who experience academic failure often develop antisocial attitudes, values, and emotions (Tremblay, et al., 1992). Failing to provide adequate instructions and curricular adaptations can be a source of frustration, negative self-perceptions and anger which trigger disruptive behavior. Thus, teacher and curriculum characteristics should be considered when assessing factors that contribute to the student's behavior as well as when developing interventions for the IAES and the setting in which the student is later placed.

A sample of teacher and curriculum characteristics that influence antisocial behavior can be found in Appendix A. Appendix D contains a list of instructional and curricular adaptations appropriate for many students in an IAES. This list should be of value to IEP teams when reviewing and modifying the student's IEP for the dual purposes of promoting achievement and preventing behavior problems. (For a more comprehensive listing of characteristics of effective instructional practices, see Ysseldyke & Christenson, 1994.)

Classroom management

For most students, a combination of classroom management strategies is effective for managing behavior in the short term and for teaching self discipline linked to the long-term development of responsible behavior. But for students with chronically disruptive behavior, classroom management strategies are unlikely to be sufficient to produce lasting improvement in behavior. Upon reviewing district-wide programs designed to improved classroom management and instructional practices, Gottfredson (1997) concluded that these programs are effective in reducing substance abuse but have little long-term effect on preventing or reducing delinquent behavior. Two nationally visible programs included in Gottfredson's review deserve special recognition in light of their emphasis on classroom management and their use of multiple interventions: the Seattle Social Development Project (Hawkins, et al., 1992) and the Child Development Project (Battistich, Schaps, Watson, & Solomon, 1996).

Both projects emphasize proactive classroom management and cooperative learning. They also include community-focused interventions. The Seattle project emphasizes "interactive teaching" (i.e., objective-based instructions with frequent assessment and remediation), a school-wide contingent reward system, career education, counseling, and a parent education component. The parent education component provides parent management training and assistance to parents for resolving conflicts involving their child's behavior at school and home.

In contrast, the Child Development Project de-emphasizes the use of rewards, while emphasizing a literature-rich language arts curriculum that highlights social and moral values. Teachers are taught to use "developmental discipline," which focuses on internalization of democratic values (i.e., social problem solving and conflict resolution skills are taught and combined with use of traditional operant behavioral techniques such as time-out, when necessary). Home- and community-building activities also are used to foster parent involvement, an appreciation of diversity, and sense of community and responsibility among the children.

Studies of both projects have yielded mixed results, varying as a function of the evaluation measure, target population, and the time of measurement. For example, the Seattle project (1) reduced suspensions and expulsions at the end of the first year and generally reduced substance abuse, but only when a parent education component was included; (2) reduced aggressive behavior, but only among males; and (3) reduced delinquency, but only among low income males included in the parent education component. The Child Development Project was associated with (1) improved social problem-solving skills, (2) increased spontaneous prosocial behavior, (3) greater commitment to democratic values, (4) marginally decreased substance abuse and delinquent behaviors, but only in schools with a high degree of program implementation, and (5) no change in acting-out classroom behavior. As concluded by Gottfredson (1997), although effective in improving behavior in the classroom, the strategies used in these two projects were not of sufficient strength to reduce delinquency.

Many of the characteristics of effective teachers, including classroom management and instructional practices reviewed above, should apply to teachers working with students referred to

an IAES. However, given the severity of their behavior, students in an IAES are likely to need the high degree of structure, monitoring, and supervision that characterizes special education and alternative education programs for students with antisocial behavior. This would include greater use of both positive- and punishment-oriented corrective strategies, such as the use of point or token systems, contingent reinforcement, time-out, and response cost (see Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 1995 for an excellent review and guidelines on behavioral strategies for antisocial children). At times, physical restraint will be needed, a technique of last resort that requires specific training and safeguards.

Teachers should rely on a combination of proactive, corrective, and instructive strategies while the student is in an IAES or in his/her next placement. It is unlikely, however, that classroom management strategies will be sufficient for improving the behavior of most students placed in an IAES. Thus, other effective interventions must also be used.

Teaching Social Problem-Solving and Social Decision-Making Skills - *What's Promising?*

As noted in the previous section, effective classroom managers strive to teach disruptive students how to solve problems on their own. A considerable number of studies also have demonstrated the effectiveness of interventions specifically designed to prevent or reduce antisocial behavior by targeting various social cognitions and emotions that mediate social behavior (for reviews, see Consortium on the School-Based Promotion of Social Competence, 1991; 1994; Goleman, 1995; Gottfredson, 1997; Guerra, Tolan, & Hammond, 1994; Hughes & Cavell, 1995; Izzo & Ross, 1990; Kadzin, 1994). The direct teaching of social problem solving is now a standard feature of programs for preventing and resolving discipline problems (Bear, in press) as well for treating those students who exhibit the most serious antisocial behavior (Kazdin, 1994).

Social cognitive interventions tend to be based on theory and research that has linked children's social cognitive deficiencies and distortions with aggression and poor peer relations. Although social cognitive interventions vary in strategies emphasized (e.g., the use of direct versus interactive methods of teaching) they share a common focus on teaching thinking skills that most children use to avoid and resolve interpersonal conflicts, to resist peer pressure, and to cope with emotions and related stressors. Often the teaching of thinking skills is combined with the direct teaching of specific social skills (e.g., complimenting others, apologizing, asking for assistance, appropriately asserting your opinion, etc.).

Cognitions and emotions commonly targeted in research and interventions include:

- Specific problem-solving steps, such as the skills involved in alternative thinking, consequential thinking, social-causal thinking, means-ends thinking, and problem sensitivity (Elias, 1997; Spivack & Shure, 1982).

- Social information processing skills, such as interpretation of cues, clarification of goals, response access or construction, response decision, and behavioral enactment (Crick & Dodge, 1994).

- Anger management and impulse control (Lochman, Dunn, & Wagner 1997).
- Social and moral reasoning (Bear, Richards, & Gibbs, 1997; Bear, Telzrow & deOliveira, 1997).
- Social goal setting (Erdley & Asher, 1996).
- Self-management, including self-monitoring, self-evaluation, and self-reinforcement (Bry, 1982; Shapiro & Cole, 1994).
- Empathy (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1997).
- Self-efficacy beliefs (Erdley & Asher, 1996).
- Social perspective taking, interpersonal understanding and negotiation strategies (Selman & Schultz, 1990).

Most current programs for teaching social problem-solving and decision-making incorporate multiple components and strategies that target the above areas. For example, Lochman's Anger Coping Program teaches children cognitive skills for controlling anger and for getting along with others (e.g., not attributing the actions of others to hostile intent) (Lochman, Dunn, & Klimes-Dougan, 1993). Operant behavioral techniques (e.g., praise, response cost) are used to reinforce appropriate behavior during lessons. A school counselor and mental health professional co-lead groups of aggressive boys during the 12-18 sessions of the program. The mental health professional also provides consultation to teachers. Several studies have shown the program to have positive effects on disruptive and aggressive behavior, and on self-reported use of alcohol and drugs.

Other theoretically-driven and empirically-validated social cognitive programs that have been used in the schools to teach social problem-solving and decision-making include:

- Second Step: A Violence Prevention Curriculum (Committee for Children, 1992; Grossman et al., 1997)
- PATHS Program (Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies)(Greenberg, Kusche, Cook, & Quama, 1995)
- Social Problem Solving (SPS) program (which includes New Havens K-12 Social Development Project and Social-Competene Promotion Program for Young Adolescents) (Weissberg, Jackson & Shriver, 1993;Weissberg, Barton, & Shriver, 1997).
- Aggressors, Victims, and Bystanders: Thinking and Acting to Prevent Violence (Slaby, Wilson-Brewer, & Dash, 1994)
- Social Decision Making and Problem Solving (Elias & Clabby, 1992; Elias & Tobias, 1996)
- I Can Problem Solve (ICPS) (Shure, 1992)
- Viewpoints: A guide to Conflict resolution and Decision-Making for Adolescents (Guerra, Moore & Slaby, 1995)

- Violence Prevention Curriculum for Adolescents (Prothrow-Stith, 1987)
- Straight Talk About Risks (Center to Prevent Handgun Violence, 1992)
- Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (Aber, Jones, Brown, Chaudry, & Samples, 1998)

The most effective thinking programs are those that include "a range of social competency skills (e.g., developing self control, stress management, responsible decision making, social problem solving, and communication skills) and that are delivered over a long period of time to continually reinforce skills" (Gottfredson, 1997, p. 55). This finding highlights the need for interventions to follow the student after leaving the IAES.

For children with more serious behavior problems, several popular curriculum packages, which integrate a variety of social, cognitive and behavioral strategies, are commercially available. These treatment oriented packages are promising based on their inclusion of components of demonstrated effectiveness, not necessarily on results of program evaluations. These promising programs are:

- The PREPARE Curriculum (Goldstein, 1988)
- Aggression Replacement Training (Goldstein & Glick, 1987)
- The EQUIP Program (Gibbs, Potter, & Goldstein, 1995).

Among the multiple components of each program are sociomoral decision making, anger management training, and social skills training. The social skills component is based on Goldstein's popular Skillstreaming curriculum (Goldstein & McGinnis, 1997; McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997). It is important to note that when used alone, social skills training has not been shown to produce lasting improvements in behavior (DuPaul & Eckert, 1994).

School- and District-Wide Programs - *What's Promising?*

There are two types of promising school- and district-wide programs. The first type clarifies and communicates "norms about behaviors--by establishing school rules, improving the consistency of their enforcement (particularly when they emphasize positive reinforcement of appropriate behavior), or communicating norms through school-wide campaigns (e.g., anti-bullying campaigns) or ceremonies." The second type of program is "aimed at building school capacity to initiate and sustain innovation" (Gottfredson, 1997, p. 55).

Two examples of the first type of program follow. Mayer, Butterworth, Nafpaktitis, and Sulzer-Azaroff (1983) implemented a three-year study of a school-wide program in which school personnel used behavior modification techniques, especially positive reinforcement, to teach students alternatives to vandalism and disruptive behavior. The program resulted in significant decreases in vandalism and disruptive behavior. In a much larger and exemplary project, "bullying" was reduced by changing school norms toward bullying (Olweus, 1992). Conducted in Norway, this project included the following multiple components: (a) various forms of media to inform teachers, parents, and students about the problem and how to counteract it; (b) clear rules against bullying; (c) sanctions against bullying and rewards for appropriate behavior; (d) class meetings to discuss

bullying and to clarify norms against it; (e) improved supervision of children, especially on the playground; and (f) increased teacher involvement in creating and maintaining a positive school climate. The project resulted in impressive reductions in bullying (about 50% reduction) as well as smaller decreases in vandalism, truancy, and theft.

An example of the second type of school-wide program was a project funded by the National Institute of Justice. As part of a government and history curriculum, 11th graders were empowered to improve their high school by applying the four-step problem-solving process described earlier (problem identification, problem analysis, program implementation, program evaluation) to the school's problem behaviors. Fighting, teacher victimization, and student fear about violence decreased as outcomes of this innovative intervention (Kenney & Watson, 1996).

In a report by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory on schoolwide and classroom discipline, Cotton and Wikelund (1990) presented a concise and practical summary of the school effectiveness research as it relates to safe, orderly, well-managed schools. Although several of the findings presented below overlap with those reported elsewhere in this document, others offer additional insight into school factors that contribute to safe, orderly, and well-managed schools.

- ✔ Commitment, on the part of all staff, to establishing and maintaining appropriate student behavior as an essential precondition for learning
- ✔ High behavioral expectations
- ✔ Clear and broad-based rules
- ✔ Warm school climate
- ✔ Visible and supportive principal
- ✔ Delegation of discipline authority to teachers
- ✔ Close ties with communities
- ✔ Enforcement of school rules, using the following practices:

    - Punishment that is fair (commensurate with the offense), perceived by the student as punishment, and delivered with support
    - Counseling
    - In-school suspension , with provision of counseling and support designed to prevent the behavior from recurring
    - Contingency contracting developed cooperatively with the student
    - Home-based reinforcement

Many of the above characteristics also were found by the Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice in their recent evaluation of model programs for promoting safe, drug-free, and effective schools (Quinn, Osher, Hoffman, & Hanley, 1998). The evaluation, which included site visits, was conducted in collaboration with the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Special Education Programs, and Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. The following were found to be important characteristics of successful programs:

- Leadership and support
- As assessment of specific needs conducted prior to implementing the program
- Ongoing collection and monitoring of data
- Coordination of school activities and active collaboration of school and district staff
- Common child-centered goals and orientation
- A positive, supportive environment
- Use of problem-solving approach (as opposed to a reactive and punitive approach)
- Clear, consistent, and simple interventions and expectations
- Emphasis on prevention and early intervention

Interventions that Involve Parents and Family - *What's Promising?*

Parent management training

Upon reviewing various interventions for treating antisocial children and youth, Kazdin (1994) concluded that four interventions show the greatest promise. Two of them—parent management training and family therapy—emphasize the importance of the child's parents and family in the treatment of children with antisocial behavior. (The two other treatments that Kazdin found most promising are problem-solving training and school- and community-based treatments.) Parent management training was included as a critical component in several successful school-based prevention programs reviewed previously. Its effectiveness also has been demonstrated in numerous treatment studies in which parent management training was delivered by various mental health specialists or therapists as the primary, if not only, intervention.

Several of the more popular and effective parent management programs are based on Patterson's Coercion Model of Antisocial Behavior (see Reid & Patterson, 1991). This model explains how antisocial behavior develops largely as a result of a combination of poor parent management practices, including dependence on coercive techniques (e.g., arguing, corporal punishment), the lack of positive parent involvement, and poor parental monitoring and supervision. These practices have been shown to be associated with noncompliant, inattentive, and mildly disruptive behavior in the early years, evolving later into physical aggression (as well as increased risks for peer rejection, academic failure, poor self-esteem, and delinquency).

Intervention entails the direct teaching of appropriate parent management techniques, especially those derived from operant behavioral theory (e.g., strategic use of praise, rewards, time out, response cost, contingency contracting), and the provision of opportunities for parents to discuss, practice, and review the techniques. On-going monitoring of the child's behavior and consultation with the parent are often provided. Children of parents participating in parent management training tend to improve on a variety of outcomes, including dropping out of school, school attendance, disruptive behavior at school and home, and indices of criminal activity (e.g., arrests, days incarcerated) (Bank, Marlowe, Reid, Patterson, & Weinrott, 1991; Webster-Stratton, Hollinsworth, & Kolpacoff, 1989).

Family Therapy

Another effective intervention for treating antisocial behavior is family therapy, defined as "a broad class of interventions in which clinical dysfunction is viewed from the standpoint of the family as a system" (Kazdin, 1994, p. 363). Family therapy employs various techniques to address family dysfunction, conflict, and maladaptive processes. A primary goal is to empower parents with skills and resources necessary for them to help solve their own family problems. Family therapy, especially *functional family therapy* and *multisystemic therapy*, has been shown to be effective in reducing delinquent behaviors, including truancy, theft, running away, and noncompliance. In a recent study in which family therapy was compared to individual therapies (e.g., behavioral, client-centered, and psychodynamic), family therapy was found to be significantly more effective in reducing violence and other criminal behavior among juvenile offenders (Borduin et al., 1995).

Home-school collaboration

Although parent management training and/or family therapy may be a necessary component of programs for students with a chronic history of antisocial behavior, less intensive interventions involving parents would be sufficient for most children, including many referred to IAESs. Christenson, Rounds, and Franklin (1992) present an excellent review of home-school collaboration strategies and programs, demonstrating their effectiveness in improving the academic and social behaviors of children, including children with behavior problems. Likewise, Sheridan, Kratochwill, and Bergan (1996) present a new problem-solving consultation model, Conjoint Behavioral Consultation, which offers theory-driven practical procedures for involving parents in the assessment and intervention process. Overall, research indicates that successful intervention programs almost always include a home-school component; therefore, the importance of parents should not be ignored when the IEP team (which must include the parent) develops interventions.

Alternative Education Programs - *What might (or might not) work?*

Gottfredson (1997) described several alternative education programs in which *high risk students* were grouped together into "school within the school" environments with a flexible curricula and with increased counseling, guidance, and administrative support services. Evaluation results were inconsistent and difficult to decipher, as found in an earlier review of five alternative schools (G. Gottfredson, 1987). Both reviews concluded that alternative education programs vary too greatly in their interventions, students served, structure, and program goals to draw any conclusions about their effectiveness. One interesting finding, however, may have implications for the IAES. G. Gottfredson contrasted a program that emphasized the personal involvement of staff with the students with another program that emphasized external control and discipline. Studies of both programs used control groups. The relationship-building program was associated with increased commitment to school, attachment to school, and belief in rules, and a reduction in self-reported drug use; there were no changes in self-reported delinquency and arrest records. The program that emphasized external control improved academic persistence, but had a negative effect on student attitudes toward school and on delinquent behavior.

Cox, Davidson, and Bynum (1995) examined 57 evaluations of alternative schools "designed to create a more positive learning environment through low teacher-to-student ratios, individualized and self-paced instruction, non-competitive performance assessments, and less-structured classrooms" (p. 220). The majority of the schools served low academic achievers or delinquents and were in urban school districts. Findings were mixed. Generally, effects were more positive when less rigorous (and less internally valid) research designs were employed. That is, a simple pre-post research design yielded more favorable results than a design that included a comparison group. When a comparison group was used, students in the alternative programs showed little or no improvement in school performance, delinquent behaviors, and self-esteem. They improved only in their attitudes toward school. When a more simple pre-post analysis was used, improvement in school performance, school attitude, and self-esteem was small, yet statistically significant. Irrespective of research design, however, the strongest and most consistent improvement was in attitude towards school—students preferred alternative schools over traditional schools. Unfortunately, as found by Gottfredson (1997), there is little evidence that alternative schools decrease antisocial delinquent behavior. Perhaps this is because the negative influences of peers and family factors on behavior are too difficult to overcome despite improvement in attitudes, self-esteem and school performance (Cox, et al., 1995).

In an analytical review of the alternative school literature, based on both a survey of the literature and years of personal experience working in alternative schools, Kellmayer (1996) identified 10 key characteristics of successful alternative programs. Such characteristics listed below should be of value to educators in IAESs, as well as to future researchers:

1. Small size
2. Good location
3. Voluntary participation of students and staff
4. Participatory decision making
5. Student-centered curriculum and instruction
6. Separation of administrative unit from regular school
7. Distinctive mission and family atmosphere
8. Flexible teacher roles and program autonomy
9. Access to social services
10. Use of technology

Given that many alternative schools and IAESs serve similar populations, it is likely that future research will find many of the above characteristics to be associated with effective IAESs. However, the extent to which alternative education programs, including interim ones, employ interventions of demonstrated effectiveness will likely have the greatest impact on program success. Many of the above characteristics (e.g., small size, voluntary participation, participating decision making) may foster successful implementation of interventions, but they do not ensure that the interventions selected are ones of demonstrated effectiveness, nor that the interventions are implemented with integrity.

Individual Counseling - *What might (or might not) work?*

Gottfredson (1997) concluded that programs that provide students with individual counseling, such as the Student Assistance Program (Hansen & O'Malley, 1996), and programs in which adults lead discussions with students about their behavior, attitudes, and values are ineffective in decreasing antisocial behavior. However, Cotton and Wikelund (1990) concluded that the availability of individual counseling characterizes effective school-wide discipline programs. These conflicting and inconclusive findings can largely be attributed to extreme variability in the techniques used in counseling programs. As noted by Kazdin (1988), over 230 different techniques have been reported by counselors and therapists, the majority of which have not been empirically evaluated.

Mentoring programs have been shown to be effective in improving attendance, but otherwise have not been adequately investigated. An exception, however, is a community-based intervention reported by Davidson and Redner (1988) in which juvenile delinquents worked with college student volunteers. The mentoring relationship included behavioral contracting, and the volunteers helped the delinquents connect with other community resources. The program was effective in reducing recidivism.

Peers Play the Primary Role - *What's unlikely to work?*

Peer Counseling and Peer-Led Interventions

The influence of peers on a student's behavior often is profound, especially during adolescence (Steinberg, 1996). Adolescents with antisocial behavior tend to associate with peers similar to themselves (Cairns & Cairns, 1994), which contributes to the stability or increase in antisocial behavior. Although peers often are a source of negative influence, they also provide a critical source of support and guidance. Peer-oriented interventions are designed to capitalize on the potentially positive influence of peers in bringing about improvements in behavior. Peer-oriented interventions include:

- Peer counseling
- Programs in which students assume a leadership role in informing others about the negative effects of substance abuse or crime
- Conflict resolution programs mediated by peers
- Group contingency reward systems
- Programs in which a disruptive student is paired with a nondisruptive "buddy."

Gottfredson (1997) examined the effectiveness of the first three types of peer interventions above in reducing delinquency and substance abuse. She concluded that peer counseling and peer-led information groups are not only ineffective but may be counterproductive. She also noted that research on peer mediation and peer-oriented conflict resolution programs is inconclusive, primarily because few studies exist with respect to their effectiveness in reducing antisocial behavior. Thus, it is too early to conclude that peer mediation programs impact antisocial behavior.

Research on the use of various peer-delivered and peer-oriented operant learning strategies also remains problematic. Although effective in bringing about short-term behavior change (Martens & Meller, 1990), group contingencies may be perceived as unfair by students and may lead to resentment toward those peers who are responsible for the group being punished or not receiving rewards. Selecting a "model" student, or "buddy," to work with a disruptive student also has yielded mixed results. For example, in a recent study (DuPaul, McGoey, & Yugar, 1997), token reinforcement and teacher-mediated self-evaluation were combined with a buddy system. A classmate in a general classroom worked with a student with behavior disorders during transition from the special education classroom to the general classroom. The intervention improved the classroom behavior of both students. However, at the end of the study the buddies of the students with behavior disorders were liked less by their classmates.

Although these findings require replication before generalizing to other settings, they are consistent with the warnings by Gottfredson (1997) with respect to peer-oriented interventions being counterproductive (i.e., negatively influencing the least disruptive students in the group) and the warning of Hughes and Cavell (1995) that the nature of peer tutoring, cooperative learning, and peer collaboration tasks are likely to be too demanding for many antisocial children. Thus, research conducted to date suggests that school personnel should proceed cautiously when implementing interventions designed to rely upon the influence of peers for improving behavior.

Adult guided peer-oriented interventions

Several successful programs mentioned in a previous section of this document (e.g., The EQUIP Program, Aggression Replacement Training, and the PREPARE Curriculum) emphasize the role of peers in the change process. They differ, however, from the interventions discussed in the section above in that these treatment programs are primarily led by adults, not peers, and that they include strong components designed to teach specific thinking skills.

Recreation and Community Service Activities - *What's unlikely to work?*

Providing recreational, enrichment, or leisure activities (e.g., "Midnight basketball," after school sports and recreation) is not an effective method for reducing delinquency or substance abuse. In the words of Gottfredson (1997), "Offering youths alternative activities such as recreation and community service activities in the absence of more potent prevention programming does not reduce substance abuse" (p. 55). Such programs are typically provided after school hours and with the intent of building self-esteem and/or keeping the participants preoccupied with sport and recreational activities as alternatives to more dangerous activities. Evaluation results show that acts of delinquency and substance abuse decrease only while students are directly supervised. These programs are more likely to be effective in reducing delinquency and substance abuse if they are secondary components to programs that directly teach social competency skills. When used alone, the effects of recreational activities may actually be counterproductive, increasing the rate of impulsive and delinquent behavior (Ross, Saavedra, Shur, Winters, & Felner, 1992).

Fear Arousal, Moral Appeal and Affective Education - *What's unlikely to work?*

Instructional programs that focus on information dissemination, fear arousal, moral appeal, and affective education have not been found to be effective (Gottfredson, 1997). This includes trying to scare students into improving, and programs that emphasize lectures and materials designed to educate students about what's right and wrong or to build self-esteem. For example, the widely used DARE program was found to be ineffective. (A revised curriculum, including more the teaching of more social competency skills is now being used). Other law-related education curricula were found to be associated with improved factual knowledge, but no improvements in behavior. Despite their popularity, curricula and programs for enhancing self-esteem have not been found to be effective in improving actual behavior (and often not in improving self-esteem itself) (Bear, Minke, Griffin, & Deemer, 1997).

Two Additional Model Programs

Many of the programs mentioned in this document offer interventions that may be appropriate for an IAES. Two additional comprehensive programs, too new to be included in most reviews, are discussed below.

Project ACHIEVE

Project ACHIEVE (Knoff & Batsche, 1995) is a comprehensive, multi-state, school-reform project that includes the following components specific to school discipline:

- ✔ Teacher training in effective classroom management techniques.
- ✔ Teacher-implemented social skills training program in which students are taught social skills, social problem-solving, and self-control management.
- ✔ School-wide staff training in the Referral Question Consultation model, which emphasizes linking assessment with interventions.
- ✔ Remedial instruction, using a curriculum-based measurement model.
- ✔ Home-school collaboration designed to increase parent involvement in the school and communications between teachers, parents, and students, and to teach parents positive behavioral techniques for managing their children's behavior.

ACHIEVE is exemplary in its emphasis on multiple components that address the major factors known to contribute to antisocial behavior and in its emphasis on enhancing the problem-solving skills of teachers. The project encourages teachers to view children's disciplinary problems as a shared responsibility. Initial results show ACHIEVE to be effective in reducing referrals for disobedience, fighting, disruptiveness, abusive behavior, and disrespect. Out-of-school suspensions and referrals to special education also decreased. Observational and interview data have not yet been reported, nor have results of a experimental/control group design. Nevertheless, given its components, the program is promising, and many of its features can easily be applied to an IAES.

FAST Track

The FAST Track Program (Families and Schools Together) consists of two basic components: parent education and social problem solving (Bierman, Greenberg, & Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1996; Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1992; McMahon, Slough, & Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1996). Both components have a strong research and theoretical base, especially the works of Patterson (Reid & Patterson, 1991) and by Dodge (Crick & Dodge, 1994; Dodge & Price, 1994). In the parent education component, parents are taught to use proactive, corrective, and instructive strategies derived from both operant behavioral and social cognitive approaches to learning. In the social cognitive component, students are taught social problem solving using the PATHS (Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies) curriculum (Kusche & Greenberg, 1994). In 2-3 lessons weekly, extending from first through fifth grade, students are taught social problem-solving skills for resolving social conflicts, getting along with others, and controlling their anger. Parents are taught many of the same social cognitive skills for use with their children at home, promoting generalization. Consultative assistance is provided to the classroom teacher to help manage students with discipline problems, and remedial reading instruction is also provided.

Evaluation studies have not yet been published. However, the program is quite promising given its broad scope, extensive funding, and its emphasis on: (1) parent education, (2) improving children's social problem solving, self management and academic skills, (3) on-going consultative services, and (4) staff development.

Necessary Components of Effective Programs

The programs described in this document that have been effective in reducing antisocial behavior and discipline problems have three components in common: (1) qualified staff, (2) interagency collaboration, and (3) evaluation. Although these components have been mentioned previously, their importance warrants further attention.

Qualified Staff with Knowledge of Child Development and Cultural Diversity

Although the IEP team has specific responsibilities with respect to the placement of students with disabilities in an IAES, no qualifications are specified for those staffing the IAES. The function of the IAES makes it clear, however, that personnel need to be highly qualified in both assessment and intervention. Writing from a legal perspective, Hartwig and Ruesch (1994) note, "Recognizing the relationship between a student's misconduct and their disability requires intensive analysis. It is essential that the multidisciplinary evaluation and assessment team and the IEP committee are comprised of individuals who are knowledgeable about a student's social, emotional, and behavioral needs." (p.30). Although this advice was in reference to developing a district-wide discipline plan, it would apply to IAES staff as well.

Multiple Domains of Competency

It is clear that a wide range of competencies will be required of staff in an IAES. Ysseldyke et al. (1997) recently delineated domains of competency required of school psychologists in today's schools. These domains are of direct relevance to all IAES staff and should be a shared responsibility. Implications for staffing, leadership, supervision, and staff development are evident and will vary from school to school. Ysseldyke et al.'s domains of competency are as follows:

- Data-based decision making and accountability
- Interpersonal communication, collaboration, and consultation
- Effective instruction and development of cognitive/academic skills
- Socialization and development of life competencies
- Student diversity in development and learning
- School structure, organization, and climate
- Prevention, wellness promotion, and crisis intervention
- Home/school/community collaboration
- Research and program evaluation
- Legal, ethical practice, and professional development

Knowledge of Child Development

An additional domain of competency that should be required of staff is the understanding of children's social, emotional, physical, and cognitive development, especially age-related changes that influences behavior. For example, in dealing with matters of school discipline, knowledge of the development of social reasoning is particularly important for understanding that "normal" children, and especially adolescents, naturally question and disobey school rules (Bear, Telzrow & deOliveira, 1997). Questioning rules is related to a desire for autonomy which coincides with increased cognitive maturity and increased exposure to different viewpoints and belief systems. Interactions with peers usually promote a healthy questioning of rules, especially rules that appear to be unfairly dictated by teachers and parents. As found by Eccles et al. (1993), increased peer influence and the desire for autonomy occur at a time when teacher attention, warmth, and supervision tend to decline and externally-oriented measures of behavioral control tend to increase. Thus, a mismatch often is created between the developmental needs of the student and the school environment.

Findings such as these not only help to explain why misbehavior often occurs but also help explain why antisocial students generally prefer small, flexible, and caring alternative education programs over traditional school programs that lack these qualities (Cox, Davidson, & Bynum, 1995). Given their smaller staff-to-student ratio, many alternative education programs are able to provide greater warmth and allowance for the reasonable expression of autonomy. These findings also suggest the importance of including students in the development of intervention plans, where appropriate.

Developmental research also emphasizes the importance of early intervention. For example, it is well established that children who exhibit aggressive behaviors upon entering school are at great risk for antisocial behavior in later grades. Disruptive behavior in first grade is a strong predictor of delinquent behavior at age 14, which holds true irrespective of the child's academic performance (Tremblay et al., 1992). From a developmental perspective, it is clear that early intervention is important, particularly intervention that focuses on the critical role of ineffective parenting skills and family dysfunction in fostering noncompliant behavior in early childhood.

Cultural Diversity versus Student Diversity

It should be noted that the above list of domains of competency included cultural diversity under the domain of "Student diversity in development and learning." It is likely that the decision not to treat cultural diversity as a separate domain of knowledge was based largely on the lack of empirical research that provides educators with guidance about how the understanding of cultural differences translates into best practices in assessment and intervention. For example, upon reviewing the psychoeducational needs of African-American children, Frisby (1992) issued the following warning, which should hold for children of all racial and cultural groups: "School psychologists should develop a healthy skepticism toward any book, article, workshop, or seminar that purports to provide specific techniques for working with 'the black child,' or promises some type of secret or mysterious information heretofore unknown for understanding 'the black child'...Such claims capitalize on educators' desperation for quick and easy solutions to complex problems. Sadly, many consumers eventually realize that such claims promise much and deliver little." (p. 545). Like many other researchers on the topic of cultural diversity, Frisby calls for greater flexibility in how educators think about complex relations between cultural factors and issues of assessment and intervention. Frisby concludes that all groups of children share similar cognitive and emotional processes and that it is individual differences, rather than racial or cultural group differences, that primarily explain behavior.

Given that there is no research support for educational interventions that "match" a particular culture or racial group, IEP teams should be cautious when attempting to base interventions on a student's racial or cultural background. Nevertheless, when assessing factors that might have led to a student's placement in an IAES, it is recommended that the IEP team include and attempt to address in individual and school-wide intervention plans the following: (a) racially or culturally biased behaviors among adults, peers, or the student and (b) differences between the culture and norms of the student's community and the culture and norms of the school (Delpit, 1995; McIntyre, 1996).

Interagency Collaboration

Evident throughout this document is the critical need for a systems approach to interventions, one that recognizes the complex, dynamic, and reciprocally interactive influences of individual student, classroom, school, peers, family, and community factors. Such an approach calls for the coordination of services traditionally delivered by school, mental health, social services, medical, and criminal justice agencies (for discussions of this important topic, see Adelman, 1996; Carlson,

Tharinger, Bricklin, DeMers, & Paavola, 1996; Knoff, 1996; Paavola, et al., 1996; Reeder, et al., 1997).

As advocated by various national organizations representing health care providers, including the National Association of School Psychologists and the American Psychological Association (Dwyer, 1996; Paavola et al., 1996), the delivery of comprehensive school health services to children should be a shared responsibility. A full array of interventions and supports by multiple community agencies is vital for altering the behavior of chronically disruptive children. "Full-service" schools need to link students in an IAES to a "system of care" that provides an array of interventions and services. This would include interventions reviewed earlier, as well as additional services (e.g., medical, employment/vocational counseling, social services, criminal justice services, etc.). Although not within the scope of this paper to discuss interagency collaboration or school-linked services, the importance of such support cannot be over-emphasized with respect to planning for students who are placed in an IAES. Additional resources on school-linked services can be found in the annotated resource list by Ahearn (1995).

Evaluation

A frequent refrain among reviewers of research on school-based interventions is that program evaluations often are of poor quality, yielding results that fail to provide valid answers to two critical questions: "Was the intervention or program effective?" and "Will the results generalize to other students or to other schools who adopt the same program?" Although practical and ethical concerns often preclude the use of strong empirical evaluation designs (e.g., random assignment of students and teachers to experimental and control groups), these concerns alone do not account for most programs failing to answer the two questions above. Instead, such failure often can be attributed to poorly implemented plans, use of inappropriate measures, and a variety of other shortcomings in program evaluation.

There are two major aspects to evaluating an IAES: (1) the evaluation of each individual student's progress during and after placement in the IAES (as included in the IEP process) and (2) the evaluation of the program's overall success in achieving its goals. The first aspect dictates the need for single-subject research designs that answer "Did placement in the IAES improve Johnny's behavior and/or help achieve his IEP goals?" The second aspect requires more traditional methods of program evaluation. For both aspects, however, the primary focus is not to determine cause-effect relationships among interventions and targeted outcomes, but rather "to make judgments about program effort, effectiveness, efficacy, and adequacy based on systematic data collection and analysis in the service of program planning." (Illback, Zins, Maher, Greenberg, 1990, p. 801). Such judgments would determine if an intervention or program should be continued, terminated, modified, supplemented, or replaced.

Failure to make program decisions based on the collection of valid and useful data is likely to result in wasted efforts, funds, and resources. Such waste not only characterizes programs that continue to use interventions and practices in the absence of data demonstrating their effectiveness,

but also those programs that continue to use interventions and practices that are supported by faulty evaluation designs and measures. A common example of the latter problem is relying solely on staff or student satisfaction surveys to measure program effectiveness.

Regardless of whether one is evaluating program effectiveness at an individual or group level, it is critical that the evaluation includes both formative (process) and summative (product) components. The formative component provides feedback that serves a self-correcting function. If the intervention is not working, changes need to be made in the intervention's implementation or in the intervention itself. The failure to implement interventions as planned (referred to as treatment integrity) is commonly cited as a major reason why many research-proven interventions fail in practice. Poor implementation can result from a number of reasons, including inadequate funding and resources, insufficient time, poorly trained or qualified staff, lack of leadership and commitment, and resistance among staff members, parents, community agencies, or the student.

A summative evaluation examines measurable outcomes, providing an answer to the question: "To what extent were the intervention goals achieved?" It is not sufficient to address whether or not behavior improved while the student was in the IAES; both short and long-term goals should be measured. More importantly, at both the individual and group levels, evaluative information should be reported to determine if the program is effective in preventing or reducing behavior problems. Multiple methods should be used, such as observations, reports, and behavior ratings by teacher, parent, and the student. Likewise, data collection should entail multiple points in time, including follow-up studies. Data gathered might include specific behaviors (e.g., number of fights and verbal outbursts, non-completion of school work) or more general indices of behavior problems (e.g., criminal arrests, truancy, dropping-out, and the use of expulsion, suspension, time-out).

It is beyond the scope of this document to review the various evaluation designs and procedures appropriate for evaluating an IAES. The special education, school psychology, and clinical psychology literatures offer multiple resources for the on-going assessment of changes in behavior. Resources on the topics of curriculum-based assessment and single-case research designs should be of particular value in evaluating an individual student's on-going progress during and after placement in an IAES. Likewise, a plethora of resources exists on the evaluation of school programs. There is little unique to the IAES that calls for measures, designs, and procedures not covered in these resources.

Summing Up

The provision of the IAES in the 1997 Amendments to the IDEA should not be viewed as just another administrative burden on schools. The IAES is a tool designed to protect the safety of all students while continuing to provide FAPE to a student with a disability. More important, the IAES provides the schools with an opportunity to systematically assess factors contributing to a student's behavior problems while linking the assessment with an array of interventions. The selection of such interventions should be guided by research demonstrating their effectiveness and by theories that explain why they work. Innovative practices should be encouraged, but only if they are grounded in theory or research. Whether or not these interventions, and the IAES itself, are shown to be effective is likely to depend on multiple factors and considerations mentioned throughout this document and summarized below:

- Schools should play a leading role in preventing behavior problems, reducing antisocial behavior, and coordinating services for those students who require comprehensive, broad-based interventions.
- The primary function of the IAES is linking assessment with interventions that follow the student upon return to his/her pre-IAES placement or to a new placement.
- Multiple interventions are necessary for improving the behavior of most students placed in an IAES. Any positive effect of a singular strategy, especially when the intervention is short-term, is likely to be temporary. Just as behavior problems and risk factors come in packages, so too should interventions.
- To produce lasting effects, interventions must address not only the behavior that led to disciplinary action but a constellation of related behaviors and contributing factors.
- Interventions must be sustained and include specific plans for promoting maintenance over time and generalization across settings. Focusing on the student's behavior while placed in the IAES is not sufficient. Interventions need to follow the student to his/her next placement (and elsewhere).
- A combination of proactive, corrective, and instructive classroom management strategies should characterize the IAES. Interventions must target specific prosocial and antisocial behaviors and the "thinking skills" that mediate such behaviors. Such a combination provides an atmosphere of warmth, care, support, and necessary structure.
- Interventions must be developmentally appropriate, and address strengths and weaknesses of the individual student and his/her environment.
- Parent education or family therapy are critical components of effective programs for antisocial children and youth.

- Interventions are most effective when provided early in life. Devoting resources to prevention reduces the later need for more expensive treatment.

- Interventions should be guided by school-wide and district-wide policies that emphasize positive interventions over punitive ones.

- Interventions should be fair, consistent, culturally and racially nondiscriminatory, and sensitive to cultural diversity.

- IAESs require adequate funding and resources. Schools should be encouraged to adopt effective interventions that best match their needs and resources.

- As in effective schools, strong leadership is likely to be a defining characteristic of effective IAESs.

- Interventions should be evaluated as to their short-term and long-term effectiveness in improving student behavior. Both the process and outcome of intervention should be evaluated.

- The IAES requires highly qualified teachers and support personnel, especially those who are knowledgeable about assessment and intervention. The staff in an IAES require on-going staff development and support services.

- Effective IAESs interventions require collaborative efforts from the school, home, and community agencies. Helping children and youth must be a shared responsibility.

References Cited in the Text

Aber, J. L., Jones, S. M., Brown, J. L., Chaudry, N., & Samples, F. (1998). Resolving conflict creatively: Evaluating the developmental effects of school-based violence prevention program in neighborhood and classroom context. *Development and Psychopathology, 10,* 187-213.

Adelman, H. S. (1996). Restructuring education support services and integrating community resources: Beyond the full service school model. *School Psychology Review, 25,* 431-445.

Ahearn, E.M. (1995). *School-linked services in K-12 systems: An annotated resource list.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

Bank, L., Marlowe, J. H., Reid, J. B., Patterson, G. R., & Weinrott, M. R. (1991). A comparative evaluation of parent-training interventions for families of chronic delinquents. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 19,* 15-33.

Batsche, G. M., & Knoff, H. M. (1995). Linking Assessment to Intervention. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best Practices in School Psychology III* (pp. 577-578). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Battistich, V., Schaps, E., Watson, M., & Solomon, D. (1996). Prevention effects of the child development project: Early findings from an ongoing multi-site demonstration trial. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 1,* 12-35.

Bear, G. G. (1998). School discipline in the United States: Prevention, correction, and long-term social development. *School Psychology Review, 27,* 14-32.

Bear, G. G. (1995). School discipline. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best Practices in School Psychology III* (pp. 431-443) Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Bear, G. G., Minke, K. M., Griffin, S. M., & Deemer, S. A. (1997). Self-concept. In G. G. Bear, K. M. Minke, & A. Thomas (Eds.), *Children's Needs II: Development, Problems and Alternatives* (pp. 257-269). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Bear, G. G., Richards, H. C., & Gibbs, J. C. (1997). Socio-moral reasoning and behavior. In G. G. Bear, K. M. Minke, & A. Thomas (Eds.), *Children's Needs II: Development, Problems, and Alternatives* (pp. 13-25). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Bear, G. G., Telzrow, C. F., & deOliveira, E. A. (1997). Socially responsible behavior. In G. G. Bear, K. M. Minke, & A. Thomas (Eds.), *Children's Needs II: Development, Problems and Alternatives* (pp. 51-63). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Bierman, K. L., Greenberg, M. T., & Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (1996). Social skills training in the FAST Track Program. In R. D. Peters & R. J. McMahon (Eds.), *Preventing childhood disorders, susbstance abuse, and delinquency* (pp. 65-89). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Pulications.

Borduin, C. M., Cone. L. T., Mann, B. J., Henggeler, S. W., Fucci, B. R., Blaske, D. M., & Williams, R. A. (1995). Multisystemic treatment of serious juvenile offenders: Long-term prevention of criminality and violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63*, 569-578.

Brophy, J. E. (1981). On praising effectively. *The Elementary School Journal, 81*, 269-277.

Brophy, J. E. (1996). *Teaching problem students.* New York: Guilford Press.

Broussard, C. D., & Northup, J. (1995). An approach to functional assessment and analysis of disruptive behavior in regular education classrooms. *School Psychology Quarterly, 10,* 151-164.

Bry, B. H. (1982). Reducing the incidence of adolescent problems through preventive intervention: One- and five-year follow-up. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 10*, 265-276.

Cairns, R. B., & Cairns, B. D. (1994). *Lifelines and risks: Pathways of youth in our time.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Carlson, C. I., Tharinger, D. J., Bricklin, P. M., DeMers, S. T., & Paavola, J. C. (1996). Health care reform and psychological practice in schools. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 27,* 14-23.

Center to Prevent Handgun Violence. (1992). *Straight talk about risks.* Washington, DC: Author.

Christenson, S. L., Rounds, T., & Franklin, M. J. (1992). Home-school collaboration: Effects, issues, and opportunities. In S. L. Christenson & J. C. Conoley (Eds.), *Home-school collaboration: Enhancing children's academic and social competence* (pp. 19-51). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Committee for Children. (1992). *Second step: A violence prevention curriculum (Preschool-kindergarten teacher's guide)* Seattle, WA: Author.

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (1992). A developmental and clinical model for the prevention of conduct disorder: The FAST Track Program. *Development and Psychopathology, 4,* 509-527.

Consortium on the School-Based Promotion of Social Competence. (1991). Preparing students for the twenty-first century: Contributions of the prevention and social competence promotions fields. *Teachers College Record, 93,* 297-305.

Consortium of the School-Based Promotion of Social Competence. (1994). The school based promotion of social competence: Theory, research, practice and policy. In R. Haggerty, L. Sherrod, N. Garmezy, & M. Rutter (Eds.), *Stress, risk, and resilience, in children and adolescents* (pp. 268-316). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cotton, K., & Wikelund, K. R. (1990, December). *Schoolwide and classroom discipline.* (School Improvement Research Series, Close-up #9. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Education Laboratory.

Cox, S. M., Davidson, W. S., & Bynum, T. S. (1995). A meta-analytic assessment of delinquency-related outcomes of alternative education programs. *Crime & Delinquency, 41*(2), 219-234.

Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1994). A review and reformulation of social information-processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin, 115,* 74-101.

Davidson, W. S., II, & Redner, R. (1988). The prevention of juvenile delinquency: Diversion from the juvenile justice system. In R. H. Price, E. L. Cowen, R. P. Lorion, and J. Ramos-McKay (Eds.), *Fourteen ounces of prevention: A casebook for practitioners (pp. 123-137).* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* NY: The New York Press.

Dodge, K. A., & Price, J. M. (1994). On the relation between social information processing and socially competent behavior in early school children. *Child Development, 65,* 1385-1397.

Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* New York: Macmillan.

Doyle, W. (1989). Classroom management techniques. In O. C. Moles (Ed.), *Student discipline strategies: Research and practice* (pp. 113-129). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

DuPaul, G. J., & Eckert, T. L. (1994). The effects of social skills curricula: Now you see them, now you don't. *School Psychology Quarterly, 9,* 113-132.

DuPaul, G.J., McGoey, K.E., & Yugar, J.M. (1997). Mainstreaming students with behavior disorders: The use of classroom peers as facilitators of generalization. *School Psychology Review, 26,* 634-650.

Dwyer, K. P. (1998, February). Using functional assessments of behavior. *National Association of School Psychologists Communiqué, 26*, pp. 1, 5.

Dwyer, K. P. (1996, February). School psychologists: Essential partners in health care reform. *National Association of School Psychologists Communiqué, 24* (Insert), 2-3.

Eccles, J.S., Midgley, C., Wigfield, A., Buchanan, C. M., Reuman, D., Flanagan, C., MacIver, D. (1993). Development during adolescence: The impact of stage-environment fit on young adolescents' experiences in schools and in families. *American Psychologist, 48,* 90-101.

Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1997). Pro-social development. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed). New York: Wiley.

Elias, M. J. (1997). Social problem-solving skills. In G. G. Bear, K. M. Minke, & A. Thomas (Eds.), *Children's Needs II: Development, Problems, and Alternatives* (pp. 27-38). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Elias, M. J., & Clabby, J. F. (1992). *Building social problem-solving skills: Guidelines from a school-based program.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Elias, M. J., & Tobias, S. E. (1996). *Social problem solving: Interventions in the schools.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Emmer, E. T., Evertson, C. M., Clements, B. S., Sanford, J. P., & Worsham, M. E. (1994). *Classroom Management for Secondary Teachers.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Erchul, W.P., & Martens, B.K. (1997) *School Consultation: Conceptual and empirical bases of practice.* New York: Plenum Press.

Erdley, C. A., & Asher, S. R. (1996). Children's social goals and self-efficacy perceptions as influences on their responses to ambiguous provocation. *Child Development, 67,* 1329-1344.

Fagan, T. K., & Wise, P. S. (1994). *School psychology: Past, present, and future.* New York: Longman.

Forness, S. R. (1992). Legalism versus professionalism in diagnosing SED in the public schools. *School Psychology Review, 21,* 29-34.

Frisby, C. L. (1992). Issues and problems in the influence of culture on the psycho-educational needs of African-American children. *School Psychology Review, 21,* 332-551.

Gibbs, J. C., Potter, G. B., & Goldstein, A. P. (1995). *The EQUIP program: Teaching youth to think and act responsibly through a peer-helping approach.* Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Pub. L. No. 103-227. 103rd Cong., 2d sess. (March 31, 1994).

Goldstein, A. P. (1988). *The PREPARE Curriculum: Teaching pro-social competencies.* Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Goldstein, A. P., & Glick, B. (1987). *Aggression Replacement Training: A comprehensive intervention for aggressive youth.* Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Goldstein, A. P., & McGinnis, E. (1997). *Skillstreaming the adolescent: New strategies and perspectives for teaching prosocial skills.* Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence.* New York: Bantam.

Gottfredson, D. (1997). School-based crime prevention. In L. W. Sherman et al. (Eds.), *Preventing crime: What works, what doesn't, what's promising: A Report to the United States Congress.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Gottfredson, G. D. (1987). Peer group interventions to reduce the risk of delinquent behavior: A selective review and a new evaluation. *Criminology, 25,* 671-714.

Greenberg, M. T., Kusche, C. A., Cook, E. T., & Quamma, J. P. (1995). Promoting emotional competence in school-aged children: The effects of the PATHS curriculum. Special Issue: Emotions in developmental psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology, 7,* 117-136.

Grossman, D. C., Neckerman, H. J., Koepsell, T. D., Liu, P., Asher, K. N., Beland, K., Frey, K., & Rivara, F. P. (1997). Effectiveness of a violence prevention curriculum among children in elementary school. *Journal of American Medical Association, 277,* 1605-1611.

Guerra, N. G., Tolan, P. H., & Hammond, W. R. (1994). Prevention and treatment of adolescent violence. In L. D. Eron, J. H. Gentry, & P. Schlegel (Eds.), *Reason to hope: A psychosocial perspective on violence and youth* (pp. 383-403). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Guerra, N. G., Moore, A., & Slaby, R. G. (1995). *Viewpoints: A guide to conflict resolution and decision making for adolescents.* Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Hansen, W. B., & O'Malley, P. M. (1996). Drug use. In R. J. DiClemente, W. B. Hansen, & E. L. Ponton (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent health behavior.* New York: Plenum Press.

Hartwig, E. P., & Ruesch, G. M. (1994). *Disciplining students with disabilities: A synthesis of critical and emerging issues.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, , R. F., & Morrison, D. M., O'Donnell, J., Abbott, R. D., & Day, L. E. (1992). The Seattle Social Development Project: Effects of the first four years on protective factors and problem behaviors. In J. McCord and R. E. Tremblay (Eds.), *Preventing antisocial behavior: Interventions from birth through adolescence.* New York: The Guildford Press.

Haynes, S. N., & O'Brien, W. H. (1990). Functional analysis in behavior therapy. *Clinical Psychology Review, 10,* 649-668.

Healthy People 2000: National health promotion and disease prevention objectives. (1990). (DHHS Publication No. PHS 91-50212). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Heumann, J. E. & Hehir, T. (September 19, 1997). Memorandum from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, *Initial disciplinary guidance related to removal of children with disabilities from their current educational placement for ten schools days or less* (OSEP # 97-7).

Hughes, J., & Cavell, T. A. (1995). Cognitive-affective approaches: Enhancing competence in aggressive children. In G. Cartledge & J. F. Milburn (Eds), *Teaching skills to children and youth* (pp. 199-236). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hyman, I. A. (1997). *School discipline and school violence: A teacher variance approach,* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Illback, J. E., Zins, J. E., Maher, C. A., Greenberg, R. (1990). An overview of principles and procedures of program planning and evaluation. In T. B. Gutkin and C. R. Reynolds (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology*, 2nd edition (pp. 799-820). New York: Wiley.

Izzo, R. L., & Ross, R. R. (1990). Meta-analysis of rehabilitation programs for juvenile delinquents. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17,* 134-142.

Kazdin, A. (1994). Interventions for aggressive and antisocial children. In L. D. Eron, J. H. Gentry, & P. Schlegel (Eds.), *Reason to hope: A psychosocial perspective on violence and youth* (pp. 341-382).. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kazdin, A. (1988). *Child psychotherapy: Developing and identifying effective treatments.* Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Kazdin, A. E., Bass, D., Ayers, W., & Rodgers, A. (1990). Empirical and clinical focus of child and adolescent psychotherapy research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 58,* 729-740.

Kellmayer, J. (1996). *How to establish an alternative school.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kenney, D. J., & Watson, T. S. (1996). Reducing fear in the schools: Managing conflict through student problem solving. *Education and Urban Society, 28*, 436-455.

Knoff, H. M. (1995). Facilitating school-based organizational change and strategic planning. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology III* (pp. 239-252). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Knoff, H. M. (1996). The interface of school, community, and health care reform: Organizational directions toward effective services for children and youth. *School Psychology Review, 25,* 446-464.

Knoff, H. M., & Batsche, G. M. (1995). Project ACHIEVE: Analyzing a school reform process for at-risk and underachieving students. *School Psychology Review, 24,* 579-603.

Kratochwill, T. R., & Bergan, J. R. (1990). *Behavioral consultation in applied settings: An individual guide*. New York: Plenum.

Kupersmidt, J. B., Coie, J. D., & Dodge, K. A. (1990). The role of poor peer relationships in the development of disorder. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.), *Peer rejection in childhood* (pp. 274-305). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kusche, C. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (1994). *The PATHS Curriculum.* Seattle, WA: Developmental Research Programs.

Lewis, T. J., & Sugai, G. (1996). Functional assessment of problem behavior: A pilot investigation of the comparative and interactive effects of teacher and peer social attention on students in general education settings. *School Psychology Quarterly, 11*(1) 1-19.

Lochman, J. E., Dunn, S. E., & Wagner, E. E. (1997). Anger. In G. G. Bear, K. M. Minke, & A. Thomas (Eds.), *Children's Needs II : Development, problems, and alternatives* (pp. 149-160). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Lochman, J. E., Dunn, S. E., & Klimes-Dougan, B. (1993). An intervention and consultation model from a social cognitive perspective: A description of the anger coping program. *School Psychology Review, 22,* 458-496.

Martens, B. K., & Meller, P. J. (1990). The application of behavioral principles to educational settings. In T. B. Gutkin & C. R. Reynolds (Eds.), *Handbook of School Psychology* (pp. 612-634). New York: Wiley.

Mayer, G. R., Butterworth, T. W., Nafpaktitis, M., & Sulzer-Azaroff, B. (1983). Preventing school vandalism and improving discipline: A three-year study. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 16*, 355-369.

McGinnis, E., & Goldstein, A. P. (1997). *Skillstreaming the elementary school child: New strategies and perspectives for teaching prosocial skills.* Champaign, IL: Research Press.

McIntyre, T. (1996). Guidelines for providing appropriate services to culturally diverse students with emotional and/or behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 21,* 137-144.

McMahon, R. J., Slough, N. M., & Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (1996). Famil-based intervention in the Fast Track Program. In R. D. Peters & R. J. McMahon (Eds.), *Preventing childhood disorders, susbstance abuse, and delinquency* (pp. 90-110). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

National Association of School Psychologists (1994a). *Assessment and eligibility in special education: An examination of policy and practice with proposals for change.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

National Association of School Psychologists. (1994b). *School psychologists' involvement in the role of assessment* (Position Statement). Bethesda, MD: Author.

National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE). (1994). Assessment and eligibility in special education: An examination of policy and practice with proposals for change. Alexandria, VA: NASDSE.

National Center for Education Statistics (1996). *Recommendations of the crime, violence, and discipline reporting task force* (NCES Publication No. 97-581). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Office of Special Education Programs (1994). *Sixteenth annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals With Disabilities Act.* Washington, DC: Office of Education.

Olweus, D. (1992). Bullying among school children: Intervention and prevention. In R. D. Petters, R. J. McMahon, & V. L. Quinsey (Eds), *Aggression and violence throughout the life span.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Paavola, J. C., Carey, K., Cobb, C., Illback, R. J., Joseph, H. M., Jr., et al. (1996). Interdisciplinary school practice: Implications of the service integration movement for psychologists. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 27,* 34-40.

Prothrow-Stith, D. (1987). *Violence prevention curriculum for adolescents.* Newton, MA: Educational Development Center, Inc.

Prout, H. T., & DeMartino, R. A. (1986). A meta-analysis of school-based studies of psychotherapy. *Journal of School Psychology, 24,* 285-292.

Quinn, M.M., Osher, D., Hoffman, C., & Hanley, T.B. (1998). *Safe, drug-free, and effective schools for all students: What works!* Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

Reeder, G. R., Maccow, G. C., Slaw, S. R., Swerdlik, M. E., Horton, C. B., & Foster, P. (1997). School psychologists and full-service schools: Partnerships with medical, mental health, and social services. *School Psychology Review, 26*(4), 603-621.

Reid, J. B., & Patterson, G. R. (1991). Early prevention and intervention with conduct problems: A social interactional model for the integration of research and practice. In G. Stoner, M. R. Shinn, & H. M. Walker (Eds.), *Interventions for Achievement and Behavior Problems* (pp. 715-739). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Reschly, D. J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (1995). In A. Thomas and J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best Practices in School Psychology III* (pp.17-31). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Ross, J. G., Saavedra, P. J., Shur, G. H., Winters, F., & Felner, R. D. (1992). The effectiveness of an after-school program for primary grade latchkey students on precursors of substance abuse. *Journal of Community Psychology, OSAP Special Issue,* 22-38.

Selman, R. L., & Schultz, L. H. (1990). *Making a friend in youth: Developmental theory and pair therapy.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Shapiro, E. S., & Cole, C. L. (1994). *Behavior change in the classroom: Self-management interventions.* New York: Guilford.

Sheridan, S. M., Kratochwill, T. R., & Bergan, J. R. (1996). *Conjoint behavioral consultation: A procedural manual.* New York: Plenum Press.

Shure, M. B. (1992). *I can problem solve: An interpersonal cognitive problem-solving program: Intermediate elementary grades.* Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Slaby, R. G., Wilson-Brewer, R., & Dash, K. (1994). *Aggressors, victims, and bystanders: Thinking and acting to prevent violence.* Newton, MA: Education Development Center.

Slenkovich, J. E. (1983). *PL 94-142 as applied to DSM III diagnoses: An analysis of DSM III diagnoses in special education law.* Cupertino, CA: Kinghorn Press.

Spivak, G., & Shure, M. B. (1982). The cognition of social adjustment: Interpersonal cognitive problem-solving thinking. In B. B. Lahey & A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), *Advances in clinical child psychology, Vol. 5* (pp. 323-369). New York: Plenum.

Stage, S. A., & Quiroz, D. R. (1997). A meta-analysis of interventions to decrease disruptive classroom behavior in public education settings. *School Psychology Review, 26,* 333-368.

Steinberg, L. (1996). *Beyond the classroom: Why school reform has failed and what parents need to do.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Stephens, R. D. (1997). National trends in school violence: Statistics and prevention strategies. In A. P. Goldstein and J. C. Conoley (Eds.), *School violence intervention: A practical handbook* (pp. 72-90). New York: Guilford Press.

Tremblay, R. E., Masse, B., Perron, D., Leblanc, M., Schwartzman, A. E., & Ledingham, J. E. (1992). Early disruptive behavior, poor school achievement, delinquent behavior, and delinquent behavior, and delinquent personality: Longitudinal analyses. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 60*, 64-72.

U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1990, April). *Age-specific arrest rates and race-specific arrest rates for selected offenses, 1965-1988.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Vollmer, T. R., & Northup, J. (1996). Some implications of functional analysis for school psychology. *School Psychology Quarterly, 11,* 76-92.

Walker, H. M., Colvin, G., & Ramsey, E. (1995). *Antisocial behavior in school: Strategies and best practices.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Webster-Stratton, C., Hollinsworth, T., & Kolpacoff, M. (1989). Self-administered videotape therapy for families with conduct problem children: Comparison with two cost-effective treatments and a control group. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*, 550-566.

Weinstein, C. S., & Mignano, A. J. (1997). *Elementary classroom management: Lessons from research and practice* (2nd Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Weissberg, R. P., Barton, H. A., & Shriver, T.P. (1997). The Social Competence Promotion Program for Young Adolescents. In G. W. Albee and T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Primary prevention works: The Lela Rowland awards.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Weissberg, R. P., Jackson, A. S., Shriver, T.P. (1993) Promoting positive social development and health practices in young urban adolescents. In M. J. Elias (Ed.), Social decision making and life skills development: Guidelines for middle school educators (pp. 45-77). Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publications.

Weisz, J. R., Weiss, B., Han, S. S., Granger, D. A., & Morton, T. (1995). Effects of psychotherapy with children and adolescents revisited: A meta-analysis of treatment outcome studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 117,* 450-468.

Yell, M. L. (1989). Honig v. Doe: The suspension and expulsion of handicapped students. *Exceptional Children, 56*, 60-69.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Christenson, S. L. (1994). *The Instructional Environment System-II.* Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Dawson, P., Lehr, C., Reschly, D., Reynolds, M., & Telzrow, C. (1997). *School Psychology: A Blueprint for Training and Practice II.* Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Appendix A

Suggested Domains to be Addressed in Assessment and Intervention

Suggested Domains to be Addressed in Assessment and Intervention

I. Child Characteristics/Conditions

Cognitive Areas:

- Short and long-term memory (auditory, visual)
- Length of attention span
- Self-monitoring skills
- Impulsivity (inability to delay long enough to think/behave)
- Ability to integrate visual/motor/auditory tasks
- Prerequisite academic skills for task
- Other

Behavioral Areas:

- Self-control
- Attributions and beliefs (e.g., others out to get me, parents do not want me to do well in school, I expect to fail, if I do not fight first then I will be hurt, my parents want me to fight back)
- Social skills
- Other

Health Areas:

- Hearing, motor, vision skills
- Specific health condition related to referral problems
- Effects and side effects of medication
- Speech/language difficulties
- Fatigue results in higher activity, less ability to focus, etc.
- Medication cycle not appropriate for school day/activities

Other

- Excessive absences
- Language other than English

II. Peer Characteristics/Conditions

- Peers reinforce inappropriate behavior
- Peers do not provide appropriate/adequate models
- Social/Academic skills of peers significantly higher (lower) than referred student
- Peers taunt/instigate student to engage in inappropriate behavior

- Expectations/values of peer group influence student

III. Curriculum Characteristics/Conditions

- Curriculum too easy or difficult
- Curriculum not relevant to student's experiences/understanding
- Curriculum presented in a way that relates to student's weaknesses (lecture/auditory)
- Curriculum presented too fast for student's learning rate
- Insufficient opportunity to practice skills
- Length of curriculum assignments too long for attention/concentration skills of student
- Philosophy of curriculum presentation too narrow (e.g., phonics only)

IV. Teacher Characteristics/Conditions

- Teacher expectations too high for skills of student
- Feedback to student not frequent enough
- Rate of reinforcement too low for student needs (e.g., teacher reinforcers at the end of the week and student needs daily reinforcer)
- Student and teacher physically too far apart
- Insufficient rehearsal time, direct instruction time, teacher guided practice
- Teacher fatigue, tolerance results in higher negative, less frequent feedback
- Teacher unfamiliar with curricular methods necessary for child
- Level of supervision (frequency/rate) too low for student needs
- Teacher teaching style related to child weakness areas

V. Classroom/School/District Characteristics/Conditions

- Classroom seating arrangement fosters problems (e.g., too close to peers, too far from teacher, near window or distractions)
- Rules/expectations in class/building far exceed skills of student to be successful
- Too many areas in building that are not supervised adequately
- Inconsistent discipline programs/philosophies/differences between staff who interact with same student
- Temperature of classrooms/facilities
- Schedule of the daily activities
- Bus ride (e.g., length, problems on bus carry over to school)

VI. Family/Neighborhood/Community Characteristics/Conditions

- Parent discipline inadequate/too severe/teaches child aggression
- Conflict/physical aggression between parents/guardians

- Lack of or low levels of supervision
- Different values/expectations between home/school
- Parent academic skills too low to help child
- Reading and related academic activities
- Parent difficulties (e.g., substance abuse.) result in inconsistent parenting, low levels of supervision, negativity
- Parent unable/unwilling to reinforce school-related academic/behavior strategies in the home
- Parent permits child to be around inappropriate adults/peers in community
- Parent expectations too high for child/too much pressure
- Parent unwilling/unable to meet health/nutrition/basic needs of child resulting in absences, inability of child to concentrate on tasks, tardiness, etc.

Note. From "Linking Assessment to Intervention," by G. M. Batsche and H. M. Knoff., 1995, in A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.) *Best Practices in School Psychology III* (pp. 577-578), 1995, Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists. Reprinted with permission.

Appendix B

Suggestions for Effective Classroom Management

Suggestions for Effective Classroom Management

Following are strategies used by effective classroom managers to create classroom climates that prevent discipline problems and promote self-discipline.

In general, effective classroom teachers:

- Work hard to develop a classroom environment that is caring, pleasant, relaxed, and friendly, yet orderly and productive.
- Show a sincere interest in the life of each individual student (e.g., knows their interests, goals, family, pets, friends, etc).
- Model the behaviors they desire in their students and convey that such behaviors are truly important.
- Encourage active student participation in decision-making.
- Strive to not only teach prosocial behavior and to reduce undesirable behavior, but to develop cognitions and emotions related to prosocial behavior.
- Work to develop both peer acceptance, peer support, and close friendship among students.
- Appreciate and respect diversity.
- Appreciate and respect each student's opinions and concerns.
- Emphasize fairness and allow for appropriate flexibility in application of consequences for rule violations (e.g., a clear accidental act that hurts someone is not always treated the way as intended malicious act).
- Use cooperative learning activities.
- Minimize competition and social comparisons.
- Avoid producing feelings of shame (focusing more on pride and less on guilt).
- Reinforce acts of kindness in the classroom, school, and community.
- Communicate often with each child's home regarding rules and consequences for non-compliance.
- Provide frequent and positive feedback, encouragement, and praise, characterized by:
  - Sincerity and credibility
  - Specific suggestions and opportunities for good behavior
  - Highlighting of the importance and value of the student's social and academic achievement
  - Attribution of success to effort and ability, which implies that similar successes can be expected in the future
  - Encouragement to behave well because they are capable and desire to do so, not because of consequences
  - A focus on both the process and the product of good behavior
  - Reference to prior behavior when commenting on improvement
  - Specifics as to what is being praised
  - Praise that is contingent upon good behavior

- Establish clear rules during the first few days of school, which are characterized by:
  - Clear and reasonable expectations
  - "Do's" and "Do not's" regarding classroom behavior
  - Attempts to develop student understanding of rules and their consequences
  - Highlighting the importance of a small number of important rules
  - Fairness and developmental appropriateness
  - Explanations and discussions of the rationale for each rule
  - Student input during their development
  - Clear examples of appropriate, and inappropriate, behavior related to each rule, and direct teaching of appropriate behavior if necessary
  - Clear consequences for rule infractions
  - Consistency
  - Frequent reminders of rules and expected behaviors
  - Their nondisturbance of the learning process (i.e., the rules do not discourage healthy peer interactions such as cooperative learning or appropriate peer discussions)

Note. Adapted from Bear et al., 1997; Brophy, 1981; Doyle, 1986, 1989; Emmer et al., 1994; Weinstein & Mignano, 1997.

Note. From "School Discipline in the United States: Prevention, Correction, and Long-Term Social Development," by G. G. Bear, (in press), *School Psychology Review*. Copyright 1998 by the National Association of School Psychologist. Reprinted with permission.

Appendix C

Suggested Strategies for Correcting Disruptive Behavior

Suggested Strategies for Correcting Disruptive Behavior

Strategies for Mild Misbehavior

[Examples of mild misbehavior include: not attending, not raising one's hand to talk, passing notes, being out of seat, and arriving late for class.]

1. ***Intervene nonverbally***

   - Facially express that you are aware of the behavior and it is to stop.
   - Establish eye contact.
   - Use hand signals to prompt appropriate behavior.
   - Move near the student, but do not get too close, unless necessary.

2. ***Intervene verbally***

   - State the student's name.
   - Tell the student what he should be doing, in private, when feasible.
   - Remind the student of the rules, in private, when feasible, and warn student that if behavior continues there will be a penalty.
   - Call on the student to participate.
   - Incorporate the student's name into the lesson.
   - Redirect the student.
   - Use gentle humor.
   - Remind the student of his/her good behavior.
   - Use I-messages (e.g., "I don't like you talking when I'm trying to teach the class.").
   - Do NOT argue; speak calmly, firmly, and respectfully.
   - Use induction (messages that promote self-regulation, not external regulation). Messages should:
     - arouse empathy and perspective taking, but not anger;
     - focus on the impact of the behavior on other;
     - emphasize that the student is responsible for his/her behavior; and
     - emphasize the importance of the behavior, and its supporting values.

3. ***Ignore the misbehavior (use extinction)***

   - Be sure to combine with reinforcement.
   - Be consistent.
   - Expect behavior to become worse before it gets better.
   - Expect behavior to quickly return to previous its state when reinforced in the future.

4. ***Hold a class meeting about the behavior, especially if it applies to several students***

5. ***Reward student for good behavior (Catch the student being good!)***

- Use verbal rewards to increase intrinsic motivation.
- Use tangible rewards only for activities that students find unattractive.
- Avoid systematic reinforcement of behaviors that do not need additional reinforcement.
- Be cautious about using expected tangible rewards; make rewards contingent upon completion of a task or achieving a specific level of performance.
- Make sure you select rewards that students like.
- Keep your program of rewards simple.
- Involve parents in the delivery of rewards (e.g., send note home or telephone the home).

6. ***Use mild punishers (such as response cost)***

- Take away privileges (e.g., recess time).
- Change or assign seating (e.g., do not allow student select seating).
- Call home.

7. ***Address academic factors that might contribute to behavior problems***

- Ensure that assignments align with the student's current achievement level.
- Review characteristics of effective instruction.
- Remediate specific academic deficiencies.

8. ***Examine and address other factors that might contribute to the behavior problems***

- Personal cognitions (goals, reasoning, desires) and emotions.
- Peer influences.
- Health, home, etc.

Strategies for Moderate Misbehavior

[Examples of moderate misbehavior include: fighting, stealing, noncompliance, and frequent display of minor misbehavior noted above.]

In addition to the above strategies for mild misbehavior:

1. ***Hold a private conference with the student***

- Meet when the student is calm, not angry.
- Respect the student's feelings and thoughts.

- Avoid arguing.
- Focus on how the behavior is to improve.
- Allow for student input.
- Use a social problem solving (SPS) and/or contracting approach (identify problem, its consequences, and personal goals; consider feelings and thoughts of others; think of alternatives; try your plan and then evaluate it).

2. ***Require a written self-examination of the problem behavior***

May include application of SPS and a contingency contract.

3. ***Develop a contingency contract***

- Define the behavior in clear and concise terms that are easy to record.
- Reward achievement, not obedience.
- Reward approximations to the desirable behaviors, if necessary.
- Contract should be fair, clear, and positive.
- Include a way to record the behavior.
- Start small in respect to goals.
- Include the student in planning of the contract, allow negotiation, and balance perceived fairness and expected effectiveness.
- Be sure that the chosen rewards are valued by the student (offer a menu of rewards).
- Achievement should precede delivery of the reward.
- Written contract should include:
  a. statement of the goals of the contract
  b. clearly specified responsibilities
  c. the times/days the contract is in effect
  d. the consequences for successful completion (rewards, and negative consequences if appropriate)
  e. starting and re-negotiation dates
  f. signatures of all parties concerned (student, teacher, and parent, if appropriate)
- Follow-up on a short and long-term basis.
- Continue to modify and change the contract, when needed.

4. ***Use self-management techniques***

- Teach self-recording (if student is able to discriminate specific behaviors and record responses).
  - behavioral diary
  - frequency counts
- Teach self-evaluation (monitors and evaluates against a specific criterion)
  - may combine with self-reinforcement
- Teach self-reinforcement

- self-monitoring + self-delivery of rewards
- precede with externally delivered reward

5. ***Use positive reinforcement techniques in a systematic fashion***
(with or without a contingency contract)

- Be sure that the student likes the reward.
- Don't assume that a social or material reward is necessarily reinforcing.
- Reinforce desirable behaviors contingently, consistently, and immediately.
- Reinforce intermittently once behavior is established.
- Use a variety of reinforcers when teaching desirable behaviors.
- Provide opportunities to practice desirable behaviors in a variety of realistic settings.
- Use social or self-reinforcers rather than material reinforcers whenever possible.
- Use *Premack Principle* (reward the child with the activity he/she prefers to engage in) or offer a reward menu for selecting reinforcers.
- Do not systematically reinforce desirable behavior that is already occurring at a satisfactory rate.
- Follow suggestions for effective use of praise.
- Follow principle of *Minimal Sufficiency* (prefer techniques that are sufficient to create change but are perceived to require the least amount of external control)
- Include parents (e.g., call the parents or send progress reports home, especially notes of good behavior).

6. ***Require the student "fix" the problem or over-practice correct behavior***
(Overcorrection)

- Require restitution (e.g., student replaces pencil that he/she broke).
- Arrange positive practice (e.g., after not washing desk top, student must wash everyone's desk tops).

7. ***Use verbal corrections***

- State name of student.
- Use verbal reprimands. (Best form of punishment, especially if used correctly.)

8. ***Use nonverbal cues***

- Keep eye contact.
- Use a firm voice.
- Move close to student.
- Place hand on shoulder when appropriate.

9. ***Use response cost***
(Remove previously acquired reinforcers upon occurrence of inappropriate behaviors.)

- Always use in combination with positive reinforcement.
- When misbehavior occurs, remove points immediately and without argument.
- Make sure that the rules are clear:
  - Which behaviors will result in the loss of points (or actual rewards)?
  - How many points will be removed for a behavior?
  - How many points are needed for a reward?
  - Can the student earn points, in addition to those given at the beginning?
- Consider including response cost within a written contract, or as part of the *Good Behavior Game.*

10. ***Use time out***

- Use after other techniques have failed.
- Be sure it is clear when and why the procedure will be used.
- Use an appropriate setting (safe, monitored by an adult, no attention, no reinforcers).
- Be firm and calm, and simply state the problem and the related rule.
- Don't argue or lecture before, during, or after time-out; discuss at a later time.
- Be consistent and keep it short (use a timer, if possible).
- Add time for noncompliance (e.g., one extra minute).
- In-class is best for ages 2-12; exclusion from class and detention for older students.
- Combine with reinforcement of appropriate behavior, and perhaps a response cost program.
- Warning! Not a good strategy for students who want to be removed.

11. ***Assign additional work***

- Assign extra chores in school (or home) such as cleaning the room.
- Warning! Student may find this to be rewarding.

12. ***Hold a parent conference and include student***

13. ***Send student to office***

14. ***Use a group intervention***

- Group contingency system
- Peer mediation

15. ***Use a Point-card system***
(a simple systematic way to monitor behavior and link it to rewards and consequences)

Strategies for More Severe Behavior Problems

[Examples of severe behavior problems include: serious violations of school rules which cause a great deal of classroom disruptive, continual noncompliance or defiance; and physical or verbal aggression toward peers or teachers]

In addition to the above strategies for mild and moderate misbehavior:

1. ***Place student in Interim Alternative Education Setting***

2. ***Provide social skills training***
   - Modeling
   - Role playing
   - Performance feedback
   - Transfer and generalization

3. ***Provide social problem solving + anger control training***

   In addition to SPS skills, focus on:
   - Triggers
   - Self cues
   - Calming reminders
   - Reducers
   - Self-evaluation

4. ***Provide systematic social decision-making training***
   - Moral discussions
   - Correction of distorted self-views and thinking errors

5. ***Impose short-term suspension***

6. ***Contact police***

7. ***Provide parent management training and/or family therapy***

   - Effective disciplinary practices
   - Monitor child's behavior

8. ***Place student in an alternative program***

9. ***Place student in a more restricted setting***

Appendix D

Suggestions for Instructional and Curricular Adaptation

Suggestions for Instructional and Curricular Adaptation

Classroom Instruction

- Establish consistent classroom routines
- Pre-teach critical vocabulary
- Activate necessary background knowledge and prior learning
- Provide advanced organizers in written or diagram form
- Write key points on the board or an overhead
- Use frequent demonstrations and models to convey new concepts
- Provide study guides that identify key concepts and vocabulary
- Use samples of finished products as models
- Provide several options for students to demonstrate knowledge (oral, written, diagrams)
- Give directions orally, specifying small, distinct steps
- Use written backup for oral directions
- Check often for student understanding
- Allot time for teaching learning strategies as well as content (test-taking, note-taking)
- Use computers to enhance learning of basic skills
- Provide students with on-going feedback about performance
- Where appropriate, present information using a multisensory approach (visual, auditory, hands- on)

Adaptations for Reading & Written Assignments

- Provide stories and chapters on tape
- Preview reading assignment in small group or with peer buddy
- Allow student to work with a peer on reading assignments
- Recognize the value of listening comprehension
- Ask parents to provide extra practice with reading assignments at home
- Simplify written directions by limiting words and numbering steps
- Highlight reading materials and study guides
- Reduce length and/or complexity of written assignments
- Allow extra time for written work
- Do not penalize for errors in spelling, punctuation, penmanship
- Provide a copy of a peer's class notes
- Mark items correct on paper, not items wrong
- Provide credit for partially completed assignments
- Allow student to dictate answers to peers, tape recorders, parents
- Pair students for completion of written assignments
- Use cooperative group arrangements with designated responsibilities for reading and/or writing across members

Testing & Grading Adaptations

- Provide the opportunity to have the test read orally
- Read directions orally, give oral explanation of directions
- Reduce the number of test items
- Simplify terminology or concepts
- Highlight key words in questions
- Teach students test-taking skills
- Preview language of test questions
- Allow additional time for test taking
- Modify the test format (e.g., short answer, multiple choice)
- Allow use of learning aids during tests (e.g., calculators, notes, books)
- Provide a menu of options for student to demonstrate knowledge other than or in addition to tests (e.g., projects, extra credit)
- Allow student to take tests with classmates in pairs or small groups
- Provide study guides with key concepts, vocabulary in advance of test
- Allow test retakes and give credit for improvement
- Create a modified grading scale or grade on a pass/fail basis
- Provide information on the standard report card indicating adaptations have been made

Adaptations for Homework

- Communicate homework expectations to parents
- Specify modifications to be used for homework assignments
- Use homework log to communicate directions and timelines
- Specify time student should spend on homework
- Provide home set of text/materials for preview/review
- Reduce homework assignments
- Allow homework papers to be typed by student, or dictated or recorded by someone else
- Have student start homework assignments in class
- Give homework on skills student can already perform

Note. From *Adapting Curriculum and Instruction in Inclusive Classrooms: A Teacher's Desk Reference* (p. 53) by C. Deschenes, D. G. Ebeling, and J. Sprague, 1994, Bloomington, IN: The Institute for the Study of Developmental Disabilities. Adapted with permission.

Note. From "Inclusion," by N. Waldron, 1997, in G. G. Bear, K. M. Minke, and A. Thomas (Eds.) *Children's Needs II: Development, Problems and Alternatives* (p. 507), 1997, Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists. Reprinted with permission.